



A Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement

Vol. 4—No. 6

1 (273)

P. O. Box 115, San Francisco, Calif., June, 1936

Single Copies FIVE CENTS

ROADS TO RUIN AND ROADS TO LIBERATION

The nullification of the Re-Settlement Project, of the Guffey Coal Act, and the Minimum Wage Law by the U. S. Supreme Court can cause but very little surprise to those who can still remember all the other decisions by the same body on the major palliative measure patches that the propounders of the new deal administration have attempted to enact as statutes of the country's law books. As faithful servants of the exploiting thieves of the land nothing else could have been expected of a body that was founded to put on the brakes upon any measure that tends to lessen the incomes of the first named. At the same time the functioning of the Supreme Court serves a double purpose: Such dubious politicians as Mr. Roosevelt could go on, at ease, in posing as most willing to "serve the people." The nine old gentlemen don't mind that a bit. Neither do the politicians of Mr. Roosevelt's calibre.

The same also applies to the Congress and Senate of the United States. In most instances it dares not go any further than the head of the government is allowed to go by the invisible, but quite well known interests who have robbed the people of all the wealth that the latter have accumulated for them. The defeat of the Frazier-Lemke act is a good illustration in point. It was a mere dole measure (although supported by the liberal and socialists as well as communists and Rev. Coughlin) for saving the farmer from starvation or revolution. On the very last day of the test (voting) the "great" new deal president showed his deliberate hand in bringing about the defeat of this measure. So, in this instance, the gentlemen of the Supreme Court will be spared the need of enacting their hangmen's role.

The thing that is of particular interest, even more so than the new deal maneuvers or the supreme court's role, is the part that is being played in all this by the "representatives" of the very class that is being robbed and ruled, the working class.

Since the year of 1929 this country has been in the throes of an economic crisis that has at this very moment reduced one-sixth of the population to a subsistence of governmental aid. Between 12 to 15 million bread-winners have been cast out of employment forever, by the machine. It is also of common knowledge that the "legal" owners of the chief industries of the land have not been forced down to become charity wards of the government. In fact, as a result of the displacement of millions by the machine, their profits have been on the increase year after year.* In the face of such a situation what have the paid representatives of the robbed ones done?

The chief spokesman of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Green, has been fulminating statements containing charts and statistics that all lead up to one central point: If the employers would only be good enough to re-employ those whom they cast out, and increase wages, plus a shorter hour-day, prosperity would be zooming in the land. Such is the measure of intelligence and comprehension displayed by the spokesman of organized labor! Not a hint of any realization or understanding that at the bottom of this country's crisis, as well as that of the entire world's, stands a humanity ridden by imperialistic conquest, solely subsisting on ruthless economic exploitation and supported by political oppression and reign.

The role of the representatives of organized labor in the maneuverings of the new deal administration are only too well known to need repeating here. Their crawling upon all fours in order to have Mr. Roosevelt help them to keep their organizations from going down to oblivion only placed the stamp of utter bankruptcy on their own ability and sincerity to cope with the crisis they were facing. And their singing in the chorus of Mr. Roosevelt's orchestra just about saved, for the time being, the whole capitalistic structure from utter collapse.

In the erstwhile defeat of the Frazier-Lemke act Mr. Roosevelt cleverly played Mr. Green as a last trump card in bringing about its defeat. This face-about tore the robe of "new deal saviour" from Mr. Roosevelt, and did as much for Mr. Green.

Following the action of the Supreme Court against the Guffey Coal act Mr. Lewis likewise revealed his caliber of ability and sincerity by immediately rushing to Mr. Roosevelt to save the situation. And Mr. Roosevelt did. He dished forth a new Guffey Coal act without any of the provisions that were to benefit labor that the former bill possessed!

Mr. Lewis, lest anyone does not as yet know it, is the gentleman who is being hailed by Haywood Brown and the communists, Norman Thomas and his left-wing socialists, Liberals and Roose-

*Income taxes for the last four years have been as follows: 1933, \$195,997,604; 1934, \$236,360,888; 1935, \$248,060,133; 1936, \$361,428,990.

Wages for those who had jobs rose 5½ per cent, which was cancelled by an equal increase in living costs.

velt supporters, as the new Messiah that is to redeem the American workers, via industrial unionism and plus a political labor party. (Perhaps these miners who formed the Progressive Miners of America could give some of their experiences at the point of shot guns under the direction of the same Mr. Lewis and his henchmen.) But in the meantime, that is, until the Liberals, communists, socialists and trade-unionists get ready a labor party, Mr. Lewis and his associates like Hilman and Dubinsky are out working for the re-election of Mr. Roosevelt.

The anarchist position towards such gentlemen as Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Green or Mr. Lewis can easily be guessed at by anyone who has the least acquaintance with the philosophy of anarchism. To our point of view, only to the extent that the robbed and ruled masses show any readiness to struggle for their rights, only that far can they hope to gain anything. That is the only way rights were ever obtained. We may be looked upon as extremists and impossibilists for saying so. But history bears out the truthfulness and soundness of this position.

Remarkable and strange as it may seem, a corroboration of the anarchist position toward all the political maneuvers of politicians as Mr. Roosevelt and labor spokesmen as Mr. Green and Mr. Lewis has recently been given by none other than the featured

labor writer—of all places—of the New York "Times," Mr. Louis Stark. In the "Times" of May 24th, in analyzing the effect that the decision of the Supreme Court against the Guffey Coal act may have upon the miners he ventures to state that:

The moral drawn by organized labor generally, from the Supreme Court's decision is that it is better to rely on labor's own economic strength than upon a governmental machinery for protection of collective bargaining.

There is very little likelihood that Mr. Green or Mr. Lewis would show any willingness to learn something from what Mr. Stark, not the anarchists, say. But the choice left for the workers is quite clear. The roads of the Greens and Lewises have led, and are leading them, to ruin and beggary. The road of economic and revolutionary action can lead them to economic and political liberation. When labor begins to pursue such a course, the doom of the Roosevelts, Greens, and Lewises, as well as the doom of capitalist exploitation and its accompanying governmental machine, will have been sounded.

The fate of the exploited multitude rests with the exploited themselves. Their ACTION or INACTION will give the answer as to what is to become of them TOMORROW. NO ONE ELSE CAN OR EVER WILL, despite all promises to the contrary.

WAR AND REVOLUTION

Often, after an exciting lecture on war and peace during which I emphatically took a stand against all wars, a contradictor would start an interesting debate. He would say:

"You call yourself an integral pacifist. You condemn all wars without exception, and highly disapprove of the attitude of those who do not condemn them. You refuse to consider the conditions and circumstances that bring them about."

"I don't intend to discuss the right or wrong of your stand. What I wish to point out is your strange contradiction. Everyone knows you to be a revolutionary anarchist. As an anarchist you teach the necessity for an entire transformation of society and you give the impression that such a total change can only be brought about by a violent revolution."

"Now, logically you cannot be in favor of both; either you are an integral pacifist or a revolutionary anarchist. As a pacifist you are against all wars, and should be opposed to a revolution since that is nothing else but civil war. As a revolutionary anarchist you are in favor of civil war; consequently you cannot be an integral pacifist."

"Well, get yourself out of this dilemma. If you succeed, I will admit that you have the skill of a magician."

My answer is then the following: You pretend that wars among nations and civil wars are always wars. Let that be so. Use the word "war," if you wish, to cloud a simple and clear issue; but the word "war" here means absolutely two different things.

Judge for yourself:

War proper takes the worker away from his work and his home. It compels him, whether willing or not, to arm himself and kill as many foreigners as he possibly can. The so-called enemies whom the worker is forced to kill have done nothing for which he could really reproach them. The worker does not fight because of hatred or revenge, and still less for his personal defense. Be he defeated or victorious this worker has everything to lose and nothing to gain. He might object to fighting other workers who, like himself, are victims of the very same exploitation and bent under the identical yoke that oppresses all workers equally. He may object to fighting his brothers in misery and servitude; but all his objections would be in vain.

But here comes the revolution, which says to the worker:

"Will you let yourself be steadily deceived by political impostors and permanently crushed by capitalists? Are you not at the string's end of endurance? Here is a chance for you and for your fellow workers, who, even like you are the victims of a fundamentally unique social organization, to break your chains and become free men."

"Do you wish to put a stop to State Oppression and capitalist exploitation? If so, rise and join your freeing efforts with the other wretches, your brothers, and all together, with a powerful arm, strong will power, and fervent heart, free yourselves by means of a revolution. It is calling you, but does not compel you to answer its call; that is up to you."

(a) Thus, war does not beg, but demands your participation. Revolution grants the choice of participation to the individual.

(b) War compels men to fight. They are ignorant of the reasons for the wholesale killing and never know the true causes nor results of war. On the other hand, the revolutionist knows the reason for the conflict and the aim of the fight in which he takes part.

(c) The worker on the battlefield does not know the enemy he is ordered to slaughter and consequently does not bear him any malice. The revolutionist decides to rebel against the social order only when he becomes tired to being kept in bondage by the rulers; when he can no longer stand capitalist exploitation.

(d) In case of war the wretches of one country fight the starvelings of another. That is truly a fratricide war, a war that compels men who are united by brotherly ties to cut the throats of each other. Those ties are stronger than those which unite people in the same country.

(e) No matter what the war is about, one way or the other it means nothing to the worker. If he is lucky enough to come home alive he will go back to his bench or plow. The game of revolution is of a capital importance because, if successful, happiness will replace suffering, and from his hell, the worker will step into heaven.

(f) The patriotic idea which throws people against each other like cut-throats is artificial, inconsistent and criminal; whereas the one leading to revolution is an instinctive and deep-rooted human feeling to bring about the well-being and freedom of all. Such an idea is natural, positive, just, generous, and one can even say sacred.

Surely, revolution, even when called civil war, cannot be compared to war proper. To say that in condemning one we must condemn the other, is pure abberation. And I think I have demonstrated the fact plainly.

There could be much more written on the subject, "War and Social Revolution," but that's enough for the present. In a future article I shall point out that theoretically we can admit the idea of a revolution taking place without brutal fights, street riots, and blood-shed. And if the revolution is connected with violence, the masses will not be the cause of it; the guilty ones will be those who retain power and wealth and who in their blindness, false pride, and greed, will have compelled the masses to have recourse to revolution.

SEBASTIEN FAURE
(Trans. by Jules Scarceriaux)

* * *

The threat to intellectual freedom is greater in our day than at any time since 1660; but it does not come from the Christian churches. It comes from governments . . . It is the clear duty of men of science, and of all who value scientific knowledge, to protest against the new form of persecution rather than to congratulate themselves complacently upon the decay of the older forms . . . No liking for communism should make us unwilling to recognize what is amiss in Russia, or to realize that a regime which allows no criticism of its dogma must, in the end, become an obstacle to the discovery of new knowledge. Nor, conversely, should a dislike of communism or socialism lead us to condone the barbarities which have been perpetrated in suppressing them in Germany.

BERTRAND RUSSELL

THE SIEGE AND FALL OF "PACIFIC WEEKLY"

(The devastating role played by the communist party within the radical movements throughout the world are only too well known. The recent "united front" maneuvers ordered by Moscow, the union of communists, socialists, liberals, church people and what not, is being hailed by some naive people as a belated move by the communists to tighten their former tactics of rule or ruin. The article that follows should prove most convincingly that the "leopard cannot change its spots."

George Hedley, the author of the article, was the late director of the American Civil Liberties Union for San Francisco. His integrity and fairness can best be attested to by the fact that he was forced out of his directorship position when he refused to cease considering it his duty in defending communists as much as he would and did the political persecutions by the government of any other party.—EDITOR.)

From Douglasite to Independent to Communist—not a baseball double play, but the story of *Pacific Weekly*; and culminating in a double out, the exit of W. K. Bassett, owner and publisher, and of his liberal friends who are unwilling to accept Communist domination. *Pacific Weekly* still is being published at Carmel. But it is no longer what it used to be; and since its columns are closed to anyone "known to oppose the United Front," its story is now told in MANI at the gracious invitation of the editor.

That story begins with *Controversy*, founded and financed by Colonel Mack. W. K. Bassett, Californian by birth and a newspaperman of some thirty years' experience, was engaged to edit that magazine. The first number appeared in October, 1934. After only a few weeks it became apparent that Bassett and Mack had too much ground for controversy between themselves to make their cooperation in *Controversy* possible; Mack thought of the magazine primarily as an organ of Major Douglas' Social Credit plan, while Bassett, though himself a radical with leanings toward Communist ideology, was not interested in a paper committed to any single political or economic faith.

They parted on perfectly friendly terms. *Controversy* was moved to San Francisco, where it has since died a painless and unnoticed death. Bassett, taking over the office and subscription list, published Volume I, No. 10 as the first issue of *Pacific Weekly*. Ella Winter and Lincoln Steffens wrote for the new paper, and advertised it among their wide circle of acquaintances. Miss Winter secured a number of articles, established connections for book reviews, and generally succeeded in giving the impression that the *Weekly* was her own paper. It was not until months had passed that many friends of the journal, including the present writer, came to realize that Bassett was in the picture at all.

But he was, not only carrying on the strenuous task of editing, but also providing the money and performing the mechanical as well as the editorial labor. He put into the paper his total personal capital, amounting to \$3000. His wife set the type, he did the makeup; together each Thursday night, with such volunteer help as they were able to assemble, they folded, stitched, wrapped, addressed and mailed the entire issue. Even with these economies of labor, expenses exceeded income, the subscription rate was low (\$2.00 per year), the field of potential subscribers was limited to liberal and radical circles, the sale of advertising inevitably was negligible, for commerce does not look with favor upon journals which attack its economic base. The \$3000 was exhausted, a few contributions came in—not enough to balance the budget, Bassett borrowed money to keep going.

A rapidly increasing subscription list and a slight rise in advertising gave grounds for hope. The Carmel Press, whose facilities were rented for the *Weekly*, allowed its bills to remain unpaid. Bassett signed a note to cover the accumulated debt, and started afresh. A campaign for a dollar from each subscriber, and one for a sustaining fund, yielded amounts just large enough to be tantalizing. Still it seemed that the future was bright; still hurried adjustments were made to tide over the present.

It is easy to say, now that the collapse has come, that Bassett was foolish and unrealistic to keep sending good money after bad. But it is vital here to realize what the magazine was, and what its editor hoped it would increasingly become. It was the only left-wing journal, devoting itself primarily to Pacific Coast affairs, which did not belong to a specific organized group. It provided information and comment which considerations of policy excluded from the daily press, and which factors of space and time kept out of the Eastern liberal and radical weeklies. It opened its columns to free expression of every point of view "left of center." It was applauded by Christians and by Communists alike—and it gave to each of them equal courtesy and consideration. It made itself so obnoxious to reactionaries that it was barred, either openly or tacitly, from many public libraries, and was vigorously assailed by the self-appointed defenders of hundred per cent Americanism. Thus *Pacific Weekly* was rendering a unique service to the cause of truth, freedom and justice on the Pacific Coast; small wonder that its editor was willing to make sacrifices and to take chances in order to keep it going.

While the Communist party never had taken official notice of the *Weekly*, and while occasionally an individual Communist had seen fit harshly to criticize it, the general attitude of Communists and Communist sympathizers was not unfriendly. The magazine provided for Communism, if not the *ex cathedra* infallibilities of the *New Masses* and the *Western Worker*, at least a fair and usually highly favorable representation. On their part, many adherents of Communist theory and practice wrote for the magazine, and did what they could to advance its interest. Most of the Thursday night help in getting on the paper was provided by members of the party unit in Carmel. Miss Winter and Mr. Steffens, whose approval of Communism and of the American Communist Party is not to be denied, continued to supply their weekly columns—though it is of record that neither of them ever made the smallest direct financial contribution, even in times of extreme emergency.

The number of known Communist sympathizers who contributed to the magazine, the frequent appearance of articles couched in typical Communist phraseology, the rather uniformly pro-Communist tone of the editorials, led many non-Communist liberals and revolutionaries, particularly those with Socialist or anarchist leanings, to consider *Pacific Weekly* merely a thinly-disguised "innocent sheet." Others of us, having come to know Bassett; having watched his columns closely, having learned something of the difficulties he had with those who were closer to the Communist Party than himself, and of the devastating pressure, of time and of finance, under which he worked; maintained, along with our frequent dissent from his opinions and our occasional disapproval of his selections of material, a faith in his independence and integrity which subsequent events have fully justified.

Those events began with the suggestion—first made, so far as this writer knows, by Michael Quin, a member of the *Western Worker* staff—that the way to solution of the *Weekly's* financial problems lay in enlisting the active and consistent support of liberal, labor and left-wing organizations. To the enquiry as to whether this program contemplated any surrender to these organizations of the control of editorial policy, Quin and his associates responded that it did not. At an informal conference on the matter held in San Francisco, Quin submitted a plan providing for incorporation of the *Weekly* as a non-profit corporation; at the same time he stated positively that Bassett—whose work he complimented in glowing terms—should be granted permanent tenure and full editorial freedom. When questioned as to why, then, the incorporation of the magazine was necessary, he replied that neither organizations nor individuals would put any money into it unless they had control. The antinomy between control and freedom remained unresolved until the time at which it became apparent that the only freedom actually contemplated was that of the controlling group.

From two hastily-arranged and not numerously-attended meetings of subscribers came voluntary gifts, to meet the immediate emergency, totaling over \$200—an average of \$1.00 per person present—though there was offered no guarantee (nor, at least in Berkeley, any hint) of any vested interest gained thereby. From these meetings, also, were elected members of a "continuation committee" to consider and suggest plans for the successful ongoing of the magazine. At its first meeting that committee divided itself into a small subcommittee on organization and a larger one on ways and means.

Nominated seriatim from the floor, and unanimously elected, the members designated to prepare a plan of organization were Peter Gulbrandsen, Ray N. Studt, Dr. Simonton, Douglas Reid, and the present writer. (Three of these had been fairly regular contributors to *Pacific Weekly's* columns, and a fourth was the local representative of the magazine.) Within the week this committee (save for Dr. Simonton, who was unavoidably absent) met with Mr. Bassett and Miss Reamer. (The latter, a close friend of Miss Winter, had served as office secretary, principally on a volunteer basis, practically from the founding of the magazine, latterly her activity had noticeably decreased, but she attended this meeting on her own volition, and precipitated discussion of the Communist issue—maintaining that there was no intention on the part of the Communists to gain control.) Holding editorial freedom to be a paramount necessity, the sub-committee drafted a plan providing for organization not of *Pacific Weekly*, but for *Pacific Weekly*—precisely similar in character to that employed with success by the *Survey-Graphic* and other nationally known journals. Mr. Bassett immediately dictated and signed a statement of approval and thanks. Miss Reamer refused to associate herself with him in this statement.

The subsequent meeting of the general committee was poorly attended. After a two-hour debate, in which the sub-committee's report was attacked principally by Quin, who was not a member of the main committee, and by two others (Keith Southard and Lou Rose) who had attended none of the previous discussions, the vote resulted in a 5-5 tie. Ben Legere of the San Francisco Council of the Democratic Party, acting as chairman, cast the deciding vote against the committee's recommendations. At once Southard presented to Legere, who read it to the group, a written list of suggested committee on organization—including only one member of the previous sub-committee (the present writer) and several persons who hitherto had taken no part whatever in the consideration of the problem. Since the solidarity of the voting "blocks" was evident, no voice was raised against the election of this new committee (since described by its nominator as "carefully chosen"); one name, that of Rose, was added by nomination from the floor. The next day the writer, in company with another member, resigned from membership on the ground that there was no point in continuing debate with persons committed in advance to a rigid and irrefragable policy.

This second "committee on organization" held two meetings, neither of them attended by a majority of its members, neither of them taking any formal action upon the major issue, neither of them ever reporting to the general committee—which, indeed, has never since been called together by Mr. Legere. Nevertheless Southard, associating with himself Mr. Herbert Resner, an attorney who was yet another newcomer to the scene, sent to Mr. Bassett for signature a legal document providing for immediate transfer of ownership to a corporation to be incorporated by these two gentlemen and Bassett, and two others to be selected by these three; for the determination of form and content of the Articles of Incorporation by Resner; for the "purchase" to be at "such terms as may be agreed upon by the parties," but "in no event (to) . . . exceed" the assumption of the \$4000 debt reported on March 5; for the possible changing of the place of publication; and for settlement of the editor's remuneration and tenure after completion of the incorporation. In other words, Bassett was

asked to surrender the magazine forthwith to a body in which he had no more than a minority voice, and then to negotiate the terms of the surrender.

Naturally Bassett refused, and issued in the magazine a statement appealing for support from those who shared his eagerness that it should continue free from domination by any such cohesive group. It was impossible to make the situation fully clear to those who had not been closely in touch with the negotiations from the outset; the specious arguments of the pro-Communist fellowship added further complications; and these factors, combined with the notorious slowness and ineffectiveness of unorganized liberalism, made the response pitifully small.

Meanwhile the weapons of the opposition group were brought into play. Not only did Steffens and Miss Winter withdraw their columns, and Miss Reamer totally absented herself from the office, but the young members of the Carmel unit announced abruptly, on Thursday, April 30th, that they "would not be able to help" that evening or at any future time. Bassett, whose work as editor had been fulsomely praised in all the earlier discussions, now was the recipient of bitter criticism verging on abuse—some of it coming in letters mailed from distant points, but apparently written on a typewriter which Miss Winter had at one time lent to the *Weekly*, but later had reclaimed. The threat was openly made that practically all the regular contributors would withdraw their support.

With the assistance of members of his own family, all of whom have contributed and sacrificed along with the editor himself, and of two friends from out of town, Bassett got out the issue dated May 4—mailing it at about 2 a.m. on May 1st. Shortly after noon on May 2nd the *Carmel Press* reasonably enough despairing of collecting anything substantial with things as they were, filed an attachment on the magazine, including the subscription list and the office equipment. (It is only fair to say that Messrs. Watson and Halsey, of the *Press*, have been personally most friendly and sympathetic toward Bassett; but they are not in business for their health, and their procedure is, from their point of view, not only justifiable but inevitable.)

The natural step for the *Press* to take was to enter into negotiations with Southard and Resner, whose plan for incorporation had been temporarily set aside. Before the appearance of the next number, an agreement was made whereby the *Press* was to issue the paper, at cost, for a four-week's period; and Bassett was to remain as editor, to be paid retroactively when incorporation was completed. The prospective corporation, "Pacific Weekly Associates," was to buy the magazine for the amount of the debt owing to the *Press*—between \$2000 and \$3000; nothing now was said about other outstanding obligations, and Bassett was to be personally responsible for the entire amount until it was paid. Southard and Resner (in practice it has been Southard and Miss Winter) were to exercise editorial supervision; this has meant exclusion of contributions from anyone who stood by Bassett in the controversy, and in general a total ignoring of Bassett's opinions and preferences.

The four-weeks' period comes to its close Monday next (June 8th); but already, since Southard and his associates have been unable to muster evidence that they can pay the consideration involved—even over a period of five years—they have asked for and secured an eight-week's extension. The only difference is that Bassett has been told that no salary is available for him, and so in effect that his services are no longer required.

This, then, is the situation as it stands:

(1) Bassett, having put into the paper a year and half of effort, his entire personal capital, the limit of his personal credit, and a considerable amount of money provided by his friends, is left without his paper, without funds, and without employment.

(2) *Pacific Weekly*, if it continues to exist at all after the additional eight weeks of grace extended by the *Carmel Press*, will be an organ, if not openly of the Communist party, nevertheless committed to the policy and tactics of that party through the sympathizers, whether "innocent" or not so innocent, who now exercise editorial control.

(3) This has been accomplished by a campaign of unscrupulous misrepresentation: first on the part of those who declared their approval of Bassett's editorship until they found he would not submit to their censorship; second, on the part of those who pretended that the second organization committee was not a hand-picked group chosen under the *aegis* of Communist purposes; third, on the part of those—largely the same persons—who gave Bassett to understand that the new program contemplated some provision for his personal future; fourth on the part of those who now, week by week, appeal for public membership in "Pacific Associates"—a corporation with a Board of Directors headed by Southard and Resner, and which does not even contemplate a membership vote on the directorate until a year hence.

Pacific Weekly, under Bassett, whatever its faults, was a free journal. Under the new "Pacific Associates," whatever its virtues, it is bound: bound by the organizational loyalty of the leadership, bound by the neo-orthodoxy of the "United Front," bound most of all by the history of its acquisition. How may we expect a genuine concern for truth, freedom and justice from those who thus have trampled upon the truth, have rejected the principle of freedom, have denied to Bassett the most elementary justice? Those who wish to read the *Weekly* will continue to do so, as long as it survives. But let them not deceive themselves, nor seek to deceive others, in the supposition that its controlling purpose is now primarily the defense and development of human values. It is inevitably and inexorably, so long as the present leadership remains in command, above all else the agent and servant of a single political faith, a single political agency, a single political tactic.

GEORGE HEDLEY

THE AFTERMATH OF THE MUTINY IN JAPAN

In the last general election, the first "clean" election in Japan of February 20, a week before the mutiny of soldiers in Tokio, the fascist influences went rather miserably down in defeat. The Seiyū lost its majority, standing for the clarification of the national polity which supposes a reduction in the right and freedom of the parliament, while the Minsei scored a victory, appealing to the people against fascism, without speaking of the defeat sustained generally by fascist candidates.

On the contrary, despite the order of the ex-service men's association dispatched to its members to vote exclusively for those candidates who proved a "comprehension" of the national defense such anti-imperialists as Kanjiro Kato (Tokio), Hisao Kuroda (Okayama) and Genjiro Sugiyama (Osaka) were returned successfully. Kato obtained the largest poll throughout the country. With merciless persecution of the anarcho-syndicalist movement and the strict prohibition of the communist party at present, these left social-democrats were undoubtedly supported by the masses as the radicals to represent their views.

The mutiny of February 26-29 was not unconnected with this phenomena. The cause and root of the mutiny was indeed complicated. True it is, however, that the military was much concerned and irritated on the ever growing tendency of the radicalisation among the masses. The legal and illegal suppression and persecution of the radicals and their activities were thought insufficient to make it slumber in peace; a counterproposal to eradicate them and isolate them from the masses was wanted. Here lies an important cause to agitate the military and make it restless.

In retrospecting the last mutiny with a consideration on the future of the imperialist policy in Japan, a fact cannot be passed by that the three admirals (Saito, Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal; Suzuki, Grand Chamberlain, and Okada, Premier), were especially sought by the rebels in the plot of assassination. It is beyond all doubt that the plot was conceived in the hope to bring about a drastic change in the principle of the imperialist policy Japan hitherto pursued. For, together with Takahashi, Finance Minister, the three admirals were taken to be largely responsible for the adoption of the national policy to push Japan positively in the South, making her take a passive attitude in the North, that is against the U. S. S. R. They were accused of neglecting to notice the Russian menace. And in fact, the army's intention in Manchuria and North China was of late under no small restraint in different manners. For instance, the bond of the South Manchuria Railway Company which is under a strict and complete control of the General Staff, the bond to raise the fund for the execution of a five years' plan to invest the capital and exploit the industry in Manchuria and North China met a flat refusal of the Syndicate Banks to underwrite, on account of Takahashi's disapproving attitude. This was only shortly before the mutiny and was then interpreted as a non-confidence in the military's schemes and schedule in the continent.

Remember in this connection the peculiar position of the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal. It is a more important position than the Premier, for the occupant of it has a voice in the selection of the Premier, as a high and permanent political adviser to the Emperor.

The new Cabinet formed under Hirota after the mutiny was forced to promise to the army a general revision in the State policy. The Premier was pressed to pledge that he would henceforth renovate the diplomacy and take a "self-initiated" policy in regard with the U. S. S. R. Simultaneously, however, with this concession, the navy demanded and had the Cabinet accept the principle of the unification of all the diplomatic actions. It is nothing but a sort of bid to the army to act on its own judgment and independent will in the continent. This precaution was necessitated in the fear that Great Britain and the U. S. A. might take advantage of Japan's unprepared and abrupt crises in northern Asia.

Undeniable it is that the danger of a conflict between Japan and the U. S. S. R. is fermenting at present in Outer Mongolia. The importance of Outer Mongolia in the Russo-Japanese relation is pointed out well in the March 9th issue (No. 171) of the Press Service of the Intern. Anti-Militarist Commission. Outer Mongolia is perhaps the weakest point of the U. S. S. R. in Far East. The territory is boundless, defenceless and poor, the population is backward and thin, with no industry worth to mention. In addition, the people are still unacquainted and dissatisfied with the new regime which is forced on them after all. She is powerless before the modern army, if no strong assistance is given.

For Japan which has made Inner Mongolia her sphere of influence and dominated millions of Mongols, and enjoys notwithstanding no confidence of them in her leadership, the existence of a region of Mongols inimical to her on the border is the source of a constant unrest and anxiety. Japan cannot establish herself in Inner Mongolia without giving a fatal blow on Outer Mongolia. The strife between the U. S. S. R. and Japan is therefore not a strife to promote, at all events, the welfare and independence of the Mongols, but to empower either Japan or Russia definitely over Mongolia.

An attentive observer should, however, not forget that Japan is, on the other hand, at mortal grips with Great Britain and the U. S. A. in China. Grips with England became most acute especially since Japan's bold advance in North China last year. As there has occurred no exchange of fire or no border incident, the acuteness is often overlooked. But in the eyes of the imperialist Japan, the domination of China is far more important than the annexation of Outer Mongolia or Eastern Siberia. And in this scheme and design, she must expect to confront the combined front of Great Britain and the U. S. A. at all eventualities. In this prospect must be found the explanation why Japan does not plunge so easily into a rash Mongol adventure as might be

expected from the wild propaganda emanated from Moscow and hasty conclusions of the careless observers. The defensive policy in the North may not be so easily turned over by Japan.

In the last election, Shakai Taisho-to (the Socialist Masses' Party) became the third party in the parliament, acquiring 20 out of more than 430 seats. This party cannot be really called socialist in a true sense of the word. Kato and Kuroda were already expelled from it for their moderate anti-imperialism. Sugiyama is spared only on account of that he is the president of the National Peasants' Union and is supported by its 40,000 members. Instead of fighting and exposing the ideology of militarism and imperialism, the party is eager to play second fiddle to its socialism of the sabre, in the hope to approach the political power. Its leaders praise the state-capitalistic conception of the military and accept and swallow it as progressive. Kato is quite right in saying that the masses are far advanced and more radicalized than their so-called leaders. For, the socialism of the sabre is invented and patented not only as a preparation of the coming war, but also as an antidote to the radical tendency ever growing among the masses. The military itself has explained it so on many occasions.

With the aggravation of the situations abroad as well as at home, the process of fascism will naturally be accelerated in

Japan by the forces of things, irrespective of the cutting of poor figures by fascism as a popular movement. The main peculiarities of fascism become visible day by day: the State control of the main industries is strengthened; the military and strategical considerations become predominant; the organized enslavement of the masses is encouraged; the inflation is let loose in parallel with the expansion of the administrative right and the limitation of the legislative one; the freedom of speech and assembly is drastically curtailed—for instance, the procession on May Day is prohibited.

Whether the radical tendency of the masses will surpass in a short period this process of fascism remains yet to be seen. But it is worth to be pointed out that, during the days of the recent *coup-d'état*, the masses did not show any responding agitation to the riot. It was because that they understood quickly that the *coup* was not started in their interests, that common soldiers were forced to march by the plotters and that the military's "radicalism" had at bottom nothing in common with their own radicalism and was rather a counteraction to their own movement now beginning to take definite shape.

Tokyo, April 15th, 1936.

(Conditions now prevalent in Japan necessitate the omission of the writer's name.—EDITOR.)

The Issue of Fascism and Nazism

Comrade Alexander Brown, in his critical analogy of my article, "Only One Real Enemy — Authority," deserves high praise and commendation—particularly so because Brown is a very close friend of mine, and criticism coming from a friend is certainly more appreciable than praise from an enemy.

Yet, with all the good intention and logical reasoning—for Brown always reasons logically—it seems to me he missed the point of argumentation, much less is he convincing in his deductions. I say this because the impression one gets after going through the whole article (see March issue: *The Nazi and Fascist Menace*) is that I have risen to defend the tyranny of Fascism and Nazism. That is not the stand I have taken at all. The main substance my article carried is that all governments, regardless of form, are tyrannical in tendency, therefore, we as anarchists should not stress upon the evils of Fascism or Nazism alone but combat the whole idea of governmental authority, which I still believe is the principal philosophy of anarchism.

But let me get to the arguments as laid down by Brown in refutation: Right at the outset he finds fault with me because I referred to Malatesta and Bakunin as advocating the abolition of state, inasmuch as these anarchists were fighting by the side of the people who struggled for their rights and liberties. Yet in the same breath he admits that "at the same time (while fighting on the side of the people) they were telling the people that as long as there will be governments in any form there can be no real liberty or happiness."

Yes, Comrade Brown, it proves very definitely that I was "justified" in quoting these people, for they did not make their struggle against one form of authority as the paramount issue but advocated the abolition of all autocracy—something the modern political struggle has left out in its hysterical upheaval against Fascism. Fascism, I must remind Brown is also a form of authority and should be combated, but by eliminating Fascisms we shall not have gained the liberties and happiness we strive for unless the entire institution of government is negated.

Brown quotes me as saying that "Fascism and Nazism have been brought about through certain economic factors." Such quotation would certainly have merited a rebuke if he hadn't left out the word "political" preceding the word "economic." What a whale of a difference it makes in the actual meaning of the phrase. In fact, he himself answers it very obligingly by stating that "while various political parties were fighting one another the Nazi party was promising the people the coming millennium if they sent them to the Reichstag."

Is this not exactly what my statement implies?—that is, if I had been quoted correctly. And does not the "disappointments of the workers" have something to do with their economic status? What about the "military forces were used against the workers by the so-called social Democratic Government," does it not again prove that all forms of government are organized for violence and oppression?

Then further. Basing his challenging remarks on more obvious facts he draws a parallel between the rights and liberties enjoyed by the citizens in this country and those deprived by Fascist dictatorships.

I do not wish to accuse Brown of side-stepping all other countries so he could have a strong argument in support of his case; possibly it was only a matter of being brief. At any rate, I am willing to give him the benefit of the doubt and let it go at that.

But what about the other government-ruled countries. Does Poland treat her underprivileged elements any better than does Fascism? Are not workers shot down in little Austria? Does England grant liberties to the rebelling Hindus? I claim the underprivileged never had any liberties whether it was under Czarism, Kaiserism, Republicanism or Fascism. The privileged classes always had them, of course—even under the most tyrannical governments; and let me divulge a secret to Brown that there are elements even under Fascism and Nazism who live by all the rights and privileges that has been granted to chosen classes in all systems of government.

That however, won't get me anywhere. I still have the main arguing point of his to contend with. Well, let me see: "We have the right," says he, "to combine in trade and industrial unions while Italy had a strong Syndicalist movement—but where is it now?"

I emphatically deny that we have the right to organize industrial unions, that is, such unions that could be compared to the Syndicalist movement in Italy. To prove my claim I would ask Brown this question. Until about two decades ago we had here an I. W. W. movement—where is it now? The industrial movement has been destroyed here as it was curbed by Fascism. Even the feeble attempt for a class struggle by the Communists has been and always will be curtailed whether the power that be is of reactionary or liberal trend. We do have political unions—yes; but these give-and-take unions are existing right now in Italy and Germany under the controlling power of the respective dictatorships just as our political unions are under the surveillance of the New Deal administration. It is only a matter of different policies. The New Deal administration has undertaken to effect peaceful settlements between workers and employers at round table talks—but no industrial uprising by this or any other administration will ever be tolerated.

But Brown does not stop right there. He stresses the argument a bit farther by pointing to the constitutional guarantee for freedom of the press and freedom of assembly we are enjoying here.

I hardly could believe such assertion coming from an Anarchist. Constitutional rights?—Yes, but for whom? For the privileged class, of course. What rights do the oppressed and the downtrodden enjoy under the guarantee? Have we forgotten the clubbing and massacring of hungry marchers? Can we ignore the deportation of workers, who in the eyes of the government are undesirable elements? Shall I remind Brown of the movement at hand to deport all aliens on the mere suspicion of revolutionary tendencies, or commonly known in the government agencies as "reds"? What if we do have the right to protest against these atrocities? Could there have been a stronger protest against the execution of Sacco-Vanzetti? Could there be a more voiceful uprising against the injustice administered Mooney and Billings?

I wonder if Brown is aware of the criminal-syndicalist laws, of the sedition laws, of the censor laws and all other laws and edicts tending to abridge and curtail the freedom of radical expression; to say nothing of the customary red-baiting, tar-and-feathering and other persecutions which the radical world has to endure at the hands of self-styled guardians of law and order. I claim that even the so-called freedom of the press is grossly exaggerated, for we really do not have the freedom of expression in the true sense of the word. As far as we can go, in even the most radical press, is to discuss or criticize mildly the policies of this or that administration, of this or that political issue or this or that economic problem. Any other attempt to enlighten the people about their social and economic condition that could rise them to rebellion would be dealt with according to law—Constitution or no Constitution.

The trouble with most people is that they cannot see the evils of authority unless it affects their own creed or belief. They fail to see the thousands upon thousands of the large masses, victims of a corrupted social order, who are kept isolated in prison cells by the laws of authority; they fail to hear the agonized cries of those human wrecks, caught in the beastly grip of chain-gang systems; they fail to realize how horrible a crime it is to send a man to the gallows on the mere accusation of having had intercourse with a woman. Such atrocities should evoke the strongest protest against authoritative rule, whether it is liberal, reactionary or dictatorial. I, for example, consider the brutal shooting of a mother of children by a New Jersey sheriff because she refused to surrender her property to a business corporation just as cruel, just as barbaric as the axing of a mother by Nazi henchmen because she failed to rear her children in the Nazi pattern. Murder is murder whether it is committed under a cloak of liberalism or barbarism.

Anyhow, I certainly am glad Comrade Brown provoked me to express myself more broadly on the subject. What is more, it gave me great satisfaction to revenge myself on our Comrade Editor for the footnote he penned down under the article in discussion.

What a sweet revenge it is . . . SAMUEL POLINOW

* * *

You take my life when you do take the means by which I live.

—WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE.

IN RETROSPECT OF CURRENT EVENTS

Mussolini and the League of Nations

The flight of Haile Selassie from Ethiopia, loaded with coffers of gold, leaving "his people" to the doomed fate of Mussolini's generals is, in itself, an event that must not be overlooked. It ought to remain an eloquent and most demonstrative act from which soldiers-to-be in any future wars could derive the great lesson that Kings or Generals, that is rulers in general (Mussolini even outdid Selassie by staying thousands of miles away from the battlefield), whilst ever ready in ordering others to kill or to be killed, are themselves, not so prone to do the dying. They prefer, even on the battlefield, to use "umbrella" men substitutes, and when really in danger, to run for their lives. Not forgetting, of course, to take along all the gold that they can lay their hands on.

Thus, with the King of Ethiopia as chief deserter, the "triumph" of the Italian *generalissimo*, backed chiefly by bribery of native "leaders," and by the use of natives for killing natives, is now an accomplished fact. The "great victory" is being followed up by the jailing of thousands of loyal Ethiopians and the simple wholesale shootings of scores of such whom the *generalissimo* of Mussolini consider inimical to their reign. Correspondents who dare to inform their newspapers of such "trivial" things are forthwith expelled. The "victorious" Italian army is told the good news that they will have to remain in Ethiopia to "protect" the "victory" and to establish there Italian "civilization" on the style of fascism.

The war experts of the world, via the lying press, are still taken up with explaining how the unpredictable "victory" of Mussolini came about. And in reality, there is so little to explain, if one would only be anxious to tell the truth.

If the rulers of England and France had really wanted to see Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia end in utter defeat, it would have happened, despite all the modern murderous equipments of warfare possessed by the Italian army.

But the statesmen liars of England and France, with the tacit approval of statesmen liars from fifty other countries, never wanted to see a crushing defeat for Mussolini in Ethiopia. (They were bent on saving the *status quo* everywhere.) That, in the end, would have meant the overthrow of fascism in Italy, just as the 1914 war brought about the end of czarism in Russia. And what these statesmen liars feared most was the repercussions that would follow in the wake of Mussolini's downfall. The people of Germany would no doubt follow suit. So would the people of Austria, Hungary, Poland, and other fascist countries.

The spectre of revolution that no doubt would have reached out to all the British and French controlled colonies and perhaps even unto their own lands, was the real reason for the League of Nations' failure to bring about Mussolini's defeat in Ethiopia.

It can therefore be safely assumed that the rape and looting of Ethiopia by Mussolini will, in the final end, be approved by the lying statesmen functioning under the hypocritical shield as a League of Nations.

But how long will or can such a Show of Deceit go on? Will this erected house of cards go crashing down before the mis-leaders of mankind engulf us in the largest wholesale slaughter ever conceived in the world's history?

It rests now upon the masses of Italy and Germany, and wherever oppression reigns supreme, as to whether their arising in rebellion shall alight anew the torch of the world Social Revolution that was begun in 1917 in Russia (and forsaken by the Bolshevik Government) and which is the only force that can end forever all wars, human exploitation and every kind of rulership.

The Left Triumphs in France and Spain

The triumphs of the left coalition consisting of the liberal, socialist and communist forces are perhaps more significant in what they imply than by what they will accomplish. And this is: the ever readiness of the people for a change. But will or can such a change take place when one considers the forces that aligned themselves and gained power by promising such a change?

In France the 72 communist deputies that have been chosen had to turn—by the order of Moscow—into jingoistic patriots, sanctioning every "defensive" measure, since the Russian Bolshevik Government has entered into a military pact with the capitalist regime of France. Should a war break out tomorrow—the communists and socialists of France will therefore be found—not fighting for the social revolution but for saving the monetary investments of the imperialistic brigands of Madame France.

In Spain, the very same Azana and Caballero that have been responsible for some of the most bloody murders perpetrated against the real revolutionary struggling workers for freedom, are now at the helm of the so-called triumphant people's front. One as its president, and the other aspiring to repeat Lenin's performance of Russia in Spain.

It is equally important to remember that the saving of the present system in France as well as in Spain by the people's fronts came just about the same time when the monetary system of both countries was tottering as it never did before.

Viewing the situation in the light of these facts it is not overstating anything by asserting that the greatest stumbling block in the way of any real revolutionary change in either country will come from those who lead and constitute both people's fronts.

The people themselves will have to learn yet that the way to combat and to annihilate fascism is not by entrusting their fate into the hands of politicians, who in the end will be, each singular faction, scrambling for maintaining the most power. The road that leads toward liberation is a clear-cut one. It brooks no compromises with the *status quo*. Had the people of Germany and Italy remembered this fact, nazism and fascism would never have gotten the upper hand in both of these countries.

They who entrust the attainment of bread and freedom, justice and happiness into the hands of any individuals, groups or parties, are doomed to ultimate disillusion and betrayal of their very hopes and expectations.

The social and political liberation from every form of exploitation and rulership can only be achieved by the direct struggle of the masses themselves. There is no middle road. The masses of France and Spain will ultimately learn this truth.

* * *

Can Wars be Laughed out of Existence?

When Lewis J. Gorin, the student of Princeton University, conceived the idea of forming an organization of Veterans of Future Wars for demanding a one thousand dollar bonus before being killed in any war, he was hardly aware as to what might and did follow the releasing of his idea. The radical minded students seized upon the idea as one of the best weapons for propagandizing their anti-war feelings. The girl students, not to be left behind, organized Future Gold Star Mothers, asking of the government to furnish them means wherewith to go to Europe in order to see the fields upon which their future sweethearts and sons will have to die. Even a chapter of Future War Liars of the Press was founded, not to speak of numerous other organizations that accompany every *pay-riotic* war.

The action of the students in the leading universities of the country aroused the liberals and other radicals to applaud and greet with enthusiasm this newly-born *trick-idea* to laugh war out of existence. On the other hand, the reactionary forces as exemplified by the fascist vigilantes of the American Legion and the Veterans of past wars weren't slow to come forward in denouncing the whole idea as inspired by Moscow and as an affront to the past sacrifices, and to the future ones that are being prepared for the gullible cannon fodder of the country.

In the meantime the yearly hour student strikes for peace came along in April, when over 500,000 students participated, and Mr. James Wechsler reveals in the *Nation* of May 27th that not only was Mr. Gorin unwilling to offer any aid or participate in the April strike, but made it also clear that his whole idea was merely intended as a travesty on the bonus seekers. This is no doubt the grimmest joke of the whole affair.

Yet, even if Mr. Gorin would have caught up with the idea that he had initiated, there would still be no good reason left to believe that by such dubious methods the slaughtering of the youth of the country could be made impossible.

Suppose that the government would accommodate the Veterans of Future Wars and the Gold Star Mothers with their set forth demands? Would it then be justifiable for a single human being to spill one's blood on behalf of any exploiter or ruler?

War is the most deadly serious part of the cancerous body of capitalism. It is part of the foundation upon which its existence rests. The military machinery of every government on earth is at work day and night to jump into service in order to protect the system of capitalist exploitation. Of all people, at least students of universities, might have known that much.

* * *

Kidnappers and the Crime Problem

Robinson, Mahan, Karpis and scores of other men and women kidnappers are under lock and seal. Dillinger, Nelson, Hauptmann and many others are also lying safely on the cemeteries. It is therefore quite an "heroic" feat for the "director" of the G-men "law brigade" to shout triumphantly "cowards and rats" at the jailed and dead . . . Our nation's kept press are applauding the mutterings of the "hero." None of these pen harlots have as much as given a hint that there is such a thing as a *background* that causes men and women to endanger their lives and liberties by resorting to kidnapings or, for that matter, to any other branch of "crime."

The jubilee over the triumph of the G-men is, to say the least, somewhat too hasty. The cause of crime has not yet been eliminated. In fact, the *causers of all crime* dare not even speak about the root that lies at the bottom of the ever pestering and devouring disease.

The problem of crime, in its final analysis, is but the realization of its primary cause: the seeking to obtain such monetary gains as would enable one to acquire the ease, comfort and security that is being freely enjoyed by such men, for instance, as Thomas J. Watson (\$364,432 yearly salary for 1935; Jesse Lasky, \$324,314; F. A. Courtney, \$298,049; W. S. Knudsen and Alfred P. Sloan over \$200,000 each), and about seventy more "esteemed" citizens who accommodated themselves to the tunes of from \$200,000 down to the pitiful sum of about fifty thousand dollars.

Suppose the Robinsons, Mahans, Karpisis, Dillingers, Nelsons, Hauptmanns and every man or woman that the machinery of the lawful thieves of the country have either judicially murdered

or are keeping under lock and iron-bar, suppose all these would have been born to the families of the Rockefellers, Fords, Guggenheims, Sloans, and all such "esteemed" personages, would they also have landed where they did? Can any of the kept newspapers or the "hero" of the G-men answer this singular question? MAN! will gladly give space to any answers that it will receive from these sources.

Capturing the imitators of real robbers is very simple. And knowing the State for what it has been founded, and it is being perpetuated, I do not expect the G-men, or the kept press, to be occupied with hounding to death or jail the real thieves, not even such brazen and uncovered "respectable" thieves like Insull of Chicago or Mitchell of New York City. They, too, the G-men and press harlots, are but the tools of a vicious system that likewise misleads some of the most courageous men and women to go on a path that ends on the gallows or in the prison cells. In this crazy world of rule and ruin one has to be a real *legalized thief* before one can be assured of immunity from persecution, of assured security, comfort and happiness. Therefore that much more the good reason for those who harbor the thought of following the path of imitators of criminals, to join in those social movements that are striving for a society where crime and criminals, rulership and ruled, exploiter and exploited shall no longer blot and darken the life of any human being.

* * *

"Social Justice" and Its Propounder

Mr. Coughlin, the Catholic priest, has recently founded a weekly newspaper called *Social Justice*. He has been kind enough to send it to MAN! from its inception. I have read some of the more important material that has appeared in it.

Mr. Coughlin's leading issues are: (a) He wishes to have the Government take over the fountian of having the sole right to print and to control the currency of the country, instead of continuing to allow a few hundred financiers to keep on having control of it. (b) Pages of his weekly are being devoted to an exposure and attack of the communist regime in Russia, as well as of the communist propaganda that is being carried on here. (c) The real solution he offers for all the evils from which the people suffer is embodied in his social justice outline as it appeared in his weekly on March 27th, pages 8, 9, 10. I shall quote some of his more important solutions from that outline. He asks questions and gives the answers, as follows:

Does social justice believe in the right to private ownership of property? Most certainly . . . Does social justice teach that factories or producing units should be owned socially? Social justice is opposed to the public ownership of factories because such a system, destroys private initiative and sane competition, would establish for the entire nation a uniform mediocrity . . . Is social justice opposed to the corporate ownership of factories? Not at all . . . If social justice is opposed to the theory of "production for a profit" what principle of operation does it uphold? Social justice upholds the principle of "production for use at a profit" . . . What then is the attitude of social justice relative to ownership? Retaining the principle of private ownership, social justice aims at increasing private ownership to such an extent that every capable laborer shall receive a minimum annual wage which will permit him and his family to enjoy the frugal comforts which . . . are so abundant. Now let me examine closer the battle Mr. Coughlin is fighting, the issues he raises, and the remedies he offers.

The money-currency reform would in the end only strengthen the powers of the State, or rather the particular invisible clique of rich thieves who would control at that time the officials of the government. What Mr. Coughlin refuses to realize is, that both the government and the monetary system are superfluous, except for the leeching role that they played until now and are still playing in life.

As to the attacks upon the regime in Russia, backed by many quoted statements from various sources, I will not dispute these at all. I know only too well that freedom of speech, press and thought is non-existent there. But, is Mr. Coughlin, who pretends to speak as the sole and closest follower of the Pope of Rome aware at all that—in the country where the Pope holds full sway, the people are deprived of the same liberties as in Russia? So far I have not seen in his *Social Justice* a single hint, not to say exposure, that such conditions prevail also in Fascist Italy. Likewise, I have failed to notice any criticism or exposure in his weekly of the horrible conditions of murder and oppression that prevail in Nazi Germany. Can Mr. Coughlin explain the mystery as to how oppression and suppression, jailing and murdering or exiling in Russia is condemnable because the communists are in control of the government, but in the very countries where Catholicism (Vatican City), fascism and nazism perpetrates exactly the same misdeeds, he keeps an utter silence about?

The quotation from his program of solving the evils from which the people are suffering gives the answer and explanation for Mr. Coughlin's double-role.

What the representative of the Pope, Mr. Coughlin, is out to achieve is to *safeguard the country from the communists or any radicals that might threaten the present system of economic exploitation and political oppression*. His repeatedly unceasing fulminations against the misdeeds of the Russian government and silence of the same misdeeds that are being committed by the Fascist and Nazi governments of Italy and Germany leaves very little to doubt that Mr. Coughlin is a most sinister and subversive tool of the scheming fascists of this country.

In Mr. Coughlin and his organ the true libertarian can only see no less of an enemy to real freedom and real justice than in the doings of the American Legion or any other vigilante organization of whose fascist misdeeds he and his organ likewise keep an utter silence about.

MARCUS GRAHAM

MAN!

A Journal of the Anarchist Ideal and Movement
Issued by the International Group of San Francisco

Marcus Graham, Editor

Subscription price: \$1.00 per year. Six months 50 cents. Three months 25 cents. Single copies 5 cents.

Sample Copies Free Upon Request

MAN! invites the collaboration of all workers and artists who are in sympathy with our ideas to send us essays, prose, poems, and drawings. No payment can be made. Where return of manuscripts is desired sufficient postage should be included.

Administration and Editorial Address

MAN!
P. O. Box 115, San Francisco, California, U. S. A.

PROUDHON'S IDEAS INTERPRETED

It is a commonly observed fact that men like danger and fighting. Why is this? Can it be possible that our love for competitive struggle signifies a profound conviction that, somehow, antagonism, in itself, has an important bearing on promoting progress? That competition, as Proudhon put it, in its broader aspects is a productive force in social economy? I believe judicious analysis will impel us to answer in the affirmative.

In the earlier stages of human development, danger was an inevitable element in life. It was in overcoming obstacles that living was insured. Men struggled among themselves to acquire the then insufficient means for the nourishment of all. In conquest, success spelled well-being and the losers died off. Through natural selection the spirit of struggle and the love of winning remained. Men like to prove their worth and superiority by competition, for success is a confirmation of our primary urge, the will to live.

In primitive life, success often meant failure and death to losers. One's achievements often involved the hampering of competitors. So, in the course of time, I suppose faulty reasoning lent the belief that another's hardships and failures necessarily meant one's advantage. We often today secretly rejoice in the calamities of others, knowing that we have avoided like fate. It is only faulty reasoning, however, which induces some men to believe that their benefit necessarily results in, or necessitates, the disadvantage of rivals, or impels others to condemn competition as unsocial. These are merely short-sighted views, derived apparently only when few individuals are concerned, never when considered from a societary viewpoint.

In its economic aspects, competition is a productive force which greatly supplements its great allied productive principles: division of labor, machinery, credit, commerce, and liberty. As we know, division of labor capitalizes on human capacities; machinery eliminates human effort, thus freeing man from drudgery; credit promotes mutuality by spreading the advantages of collective force; commerce stimulates consumption and thereby production; and liberty gives free play to initiative. But it is competition that insures responsibility, socializes knowledge, and stimulates progress. It is as necessary as its antithesis, monopoly, which implies productive independence. Every scheme for social betterment which fails to recognize the necessity of giving free play to each and every one of the productive principles deserves the appellation utopian. Nevertheless, we hardly see a societary proposal that does not have as its essence the legal creation of some new monopoly or privilege. (Perhaps it should be noted, for clearness, that there are two distinct causes of monopoly—one natural, the other artificial, that is, by the legal creation of monopolistic privileges by the State. It is the latter to which Anarchism is opposed.)

It was Pierre J. Proudhon who first showed the profound bearing of these elementary productive principles on the evolution of economic society, which is to say, on the course of history. He showed how man, zig-zagging through time, was more or less a puppet to his ignorance of economic forces. He predicted men's attempts to conduct production and distribution by decree. And he showed that "man could neither think better nor act worse." He referred to collectivism. Probably no man since his time has as thoroughly understood economic laws and their application to human society as did Proudhon.

Thus we have reformers and revolutionists all with one foot more or less in the utopia which Proudhon made it his life work to fight against. Marx, filching from Proudhon, and also using the Hegelian dialectic, became confused in the same metaphysical jargon he convicted Proudhon of and wound up with a system. Kropotkin apparently knew practically nothing of economic principles, he tried to base economics on the emotions, he erected a system. All the utopians before Proudhon erected systems, and all the "planned economies" conceived since his time are systems. Systems are always the result of either of two things—insufficient knowledge or ulterior motive. Gesell's "Natural Economic Order" is a system originated by a libertarian laboring under serious fallacies on the nature of money and credit; Technocracy is a system promulgated by men who understand the technique of production but who lack knowledge of economic law; the fascist corporate state is a system, the ulterior motive of which is to preserve the status quo; and communism results from the incompetent mental efforts of the proletariat to formulate an ideal or "classless society."

But they are all, from the standpoint of the intent from which they originate, utopias. That is to say, they all overlook important and inevitable features of life, especially productive life. Living, in all its phases, is too broad and complex to be straightlaced into a system. Difference of opinion necessitates as many forms of productive endeavor. Thus, Gesell's so-called "Free Money" system would collapse when it came to a show-down; Technocracy will necessarily fail to accomplish its objectives as it does not take into consideration all the factors involved in production. Fascism will not be able to stem the course of progress. Neither will communism ever get an effective start because it will ever be opposed by thinking people. Nevertheless they all contain important elements of truth, both in their criticisms of the existing economic order and in the proposals they embrace. Yet all attempts to inaugurate any of them as systems will necessitate the continual and increasing use of tyranny and violence. It is improbable that any of them could last even as long as the prevailing Capitalism which is now heading into bankruptcy. Well intentioned as they all are, Gesell, Kropotkin, Marx, and the technocrats are all utopians of the first water. The well versed will ever smile at the naive attempts to favorably compare any of these men to Proudhon.

Pierre J. Proudhon is the only man, to date, with the exception of those of his followers who understand him, who was unalterably opposed to systems. He is the only man, to my knowledge, who made a comprehensive and exhaustive exposition of the

effects of the great principles of social economy and who showed that association, the fatal basic recourse of all utopians, is not an organic law, that it is not an economic force, and that it is not a principle of social order. That is to say, Proudhon claimed that while the helplessness of men in isolation impelled them to associate, it was a mistake to attempt to decree which way they must associate. Proudhon held that contradiction was an inevitable feature of life, that, in one sense, nothing could be abolished in this world, that the social problem was one of reconciliation and equilibrium. He showed, not by dreams and aspirations but by fact and logic, that justice and equity demanded the untrammeled liberty of economic forces, that the end and means of progress is liberty, and that social order is achievable only in a positive Anarchy. Anarchy, to Proudhon, meant a philosophy of Change, and in this view he anticipated the conclusions of evolutionary philosophers. Anarchy did not mean a set form or organization but meant the liberty to try all forms. But liberty also meant equality of opportunity which always tended toward, if never arriving at, absolute economic equality. Human equality is the unconscious aim which impels social legislation but man was not to be blamed if in his ignorance he failed to understand that in so legislating he was frustrating the very thing he was trying to achieve.

Unlike Kropotkin who was over-influenced by humanitarian feelings, unlike Gesell, whose fallacies about money would not permit him to totally free himself from the necessity of the State, unlike Marx whose faulty metabolism caused a venomous hate to mar his reasoning, unlike the technocrats who are superficially influenced by temporary manifestations in society, Proudhon was not influenced by preconceived ideas. A study of the evolution of his thought will evince that Proudhon did not start out with something to prove in his mind, but that like a true scientist, he was trying to find out something. It is true, as Marx disparagingly said of him, that Proudhon was looking for societary principles. But is this not what every real scientist does—endeavor to discover natural laws?

Proudhon proved that there is an economic science. He shows that economic laws were independent of the will of man although man could profit by knowledge of them when he understood them. He exhausted ways of demonstrating that it is impossible to ascertain the collective opinion of society, indeed, that the conception of it is generally a fiction. Thus, beside showing that the State originated for robbery, he demonstrated that despotism and robbery are necessary concomitants of the State—that governments are necessarily impotent, meddlesome, and reactionary. Proudhon was the first to explain the cause of in-

terest, attributing it to the shortage of money and its monopolistic control consequent to the royalty of gold. He predicted the then coming power of the financial capitalist. He was the first to demolish, analytically, the fiction of the productivity of capital. Proudhon showed the complete ignorance of socialists on the nature of money and credit and their utter bewilderment when it came to the question of distribution, all of whom had to recourse to arbitrary law to solve the problem. Thus these laws range all the way from the transparent communistic law "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" to the arbitrary determinations of value by such factors as energy (technocratic) and time (a common socialistic unit). Marx came close to the solution of the problem of value, giving an exact abstract definition of value, but he did not know the clue of social organization by which value could be determined.

Possibly these seem pretty broad assertions, and no doubt will be resented by followers of the several men in question. Nevertheless, a conviction of their truth has been arrived at through a study of economics which comprised volumes of utopian aspirations, volumes of bunk, a few sound books, and, fortunately, four great works of Proudhon—*What is Property?*, *System of Economical Contradictions*, *Solution of the Social Problem*, and *The General Idea of the Revolution of the Nineteenth Century*. True, understanding Proudhon might require much supplementary reading, for he did not always deal in details. Moreover, he is not an easy man to understand, partly because of his recourse to paradox, partly because of his peculiar metaphysical style, and partly because of his comprehensive manner of handling the topic at hand. But once one gets the "hang" of his style and the trend of his thought, he will be prepared to receive some worthwhile and profound sociological knowledge. It is significant to note the savageness of the attacks Marx made upon, the savagery of a man whose inferiority complex not only colored all his writings, but which, when coupled with his great intellect and his unfortunately mad desire to be known as the greatest of socialistic thinkers, caused him to ridiculously hate with an especial venom anyone who promised to be a successful rival, these facts, I say, might indicate Proudhon's genius.

We were talking of fighting, were we not? Yes, let us fight it out. Let us test our ideas in the fire of criticism. Let us battle, using thought and argument as weapons. If our arguments are false, down we will go in the conflict, but fortunately we will live to choose better ideas in the future. Progress is made by talking, discussion, controversy.

LAURANCE LABADIE

The Crimes of Cuba's Rulers

The military victory of September 4th of last year has placed in control of the State the military class that is profiting the most from the present exploitation of the masses in Cuba. Its brutal reign of terror has even frightened the indifferent elements of the people.

It is nothing new to find a government defending its reign by employing arms against its opponents. This is inherent in its very reign as a ruling power. But the military reign in Cuba, headed by the sinister Batista, the sergeant of yesterday and traitor to every utterance he ever made, has reached such a huge toll of crimes committed that only an international protest of condemnation may be able to stay it.

Numerous indeed are the crimes being committed by the military reign in Cuba today. But it should not be forgotten that this sadistic reign is being carried on all along with the acquiescence of the representative of the United States Government—the perverse Jefferson Caffery. We here are fully aware of this fact. We know that all the crimes that have been perpetrated on this chained island—from the monstrous and repugnant assassination of the student Armand Feito and the baker Crescencio Freiro to all the crimes that have followed these—not one has escaped our public condemnation.

The military fascist reign of September the 4th has made its occupation the one of murder. To dispose quick and summarily of all enemies who fall into their nets. Mercenary troops, hoping for elevation, as in the cases of Caro and Cobo, assassinating en masse the supposed sequestrators of Gorostiza, to those of Castano, to those of the "Encanto" Theatre, etc., etc.

But there is something that even surpasses all these crimes. Scarce a month had passed since the bodies of two young men, one a student, have been found close to the watchman's lodge of the Columbia's shot camp, their genital parts truncated and bulletted—all ample evidence of their having been sadistically tortured, when right in the center of Havana, and even with greater impudence, coupled by the purchased silence of the press and the complicity of the courts, are found two new bodies: that of Francisco Fernandez Rodriguez, who was Mayor of Batabao Town, in the days of the Grau San Martin Government, and the secretary of the same Municipality, in those days, Jose Rey Quintana.

Both had their testicles and legs perforated, punched, terrible torture by which it was hoped to wring from them implicating confessions.

Although the signs of inhuman sadistic tortures were so evident, the press simply reported that their bodies presented a few shots in the head and the heart, "the cases" being "surrounded by impenetrable mystery" . . .

This happened on March 30 and scarcely two days were gone when another sadistic murder is committed upon a young man near Jovellanos Town. In the same bloody tragical week the Pedraza and Batista sect arrested a nameless young man, also an oppositionist, tormenting him in a horrible manner to the extreme of injecting him muriatic in the urethra in order to obtain con-

fessions, he is thrown down from the second floor of the Radio-Repressive Section of the police, dying instantly.

On April 5th the press prints this notice:

Numerous arms and munitions occupies the police in Guanabacoa. Arrests. Investigations . . .

The evening press of the same date publishes then the following:

Four men killed by bullets from an automobile. They were being conducted from the next town of Guanabacoa by the police and were attacked from an automobile that was occupied by some unknown men who ran away aided by the prevailing darkness . . .

The dead were Antonio Mesa, 58, his three sons, Albert, Anthony and Joseph, 29, 27, and 29 years, respectively.

To end the most bestial and infamous act in the history of Cuba, the mother of these three young men and wife of Mesa, was found hanged on the morning following the massacre, where the police claims to have found some arms.

Aroused by the scandal that this outrageous massacre has evoked the Supreme Court Justice issued an order to the Pedraza sadistic murderers not again to publicize their deeds! By this the proceeding of murdering people has been simplified. It signifies a return to the machadist system to throw the dead into the waters of Havana Bay, in order to be sharks' pasture. It also signifies something else: many individuals suddenly disappear from their family without any trace left. Such press items have often appeared before. The most recent one is that of Francisco Menendez Bruno, partner of the Hispano Films of Cuba, who since 12 days or more has disappeared from his home in the mysterious manner that has all the "trade marks" of the Havana Police Headquarters.

We are bringing forth all these facts before the entire world in order to show the ordeals that the people of Cuba are being made to go through. At the same time we raise our utmost protest anew before the liberal and labor world—asking that these facts be given the utmost publicity. We ask for moral aid in this campaign which we have taken upon ourselves against the terror of Batista and his mercenary court.

At the same time, we must point out, that the people of Cuba are undergoing such a sadistic ordeal the so-called radical Government of Spain has gone to all lengths in paying homage and tribute to Batista and all his military chiefs, who are the direct material authors of all the brutal crimes and of the terror that prevails in Cuba. The following press notice speaks for itself:

Today Colonel Batista will be honored by the Spanish ambassador. The act will take place in the Embassy building at five o'clock in the evening. Sir Don Luciano Lopez Ferrer will bestow upon Colonel Fulgencio Batista Zaldivar, chief of the constitutional army, with one of the most precious insignias of the Republic of Spain.

FEDERATION OF ANARCHIST GROUPS OF CUBA

CORRESPONDENCE AND DISCUSSION

What Happened in Spain?

In the May issue of your paper was published a letter from Spain by Tranquillo. This Tranquillo seems to specialize in attacking the C. N. T. As a proof that the anarcho-syndicalists have been taking part in the recent electoral "campaign," he quotes a declaration made by two "prominent officials of the C. N. T. to a Madrid newspaper."

In answer to this may I be permitted to reproduce a brief statement issued by the Secretariat of the International Working Men's Association (the world organization for anarcho-syndicalism, with which the C. N. T. is affiliated). That statement appeared in the *Combat Syndicaliste*, the official organ of the C. G. T. S. R., the French anarcho-syndicalists, and here it is:

THE C. N. T. ANSWERS ITS SLANDERERS

The comrades that have read in L'Oeuvre of April the 21st an interview entitled, "What is Anarcho-Syndicalism" must have been shocked by the declaration supposedly made by R. Pena, that "in the presence of the 1936 elections the C. N. T. has declared itself neutral and advised its adherents to vote for the People's Front. And that now we remain on our positions of neutrality."

We have immediately communicated with the National Committee of the C. N. T. and this is the telegram we received:

Reference Oeuvre inexact. In February elections C. N. T. was non-political and did not advise anybody to vote, not even for People's Front. Actual position as always. Opposition to every government and state. Favors revolutionary and libertarian direct action.

THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE

No commentaries are necessary to this declaration. Only we would like to remind our comrades the danger of giving interviews to the bourgeois press.

THE SECRETARIAT OF THE I. W. M. A.

Now, is this plain enough, or is it not? Why did Tranquillo bring to the witness stand "a Madrid newspaper?" Why didn't he quote some leaflet, or some articles in the C. N. T. publications, calling the anarcho-syndicalists to the ballot box? Why didn't he?

After having "proven" what kind of fellows the anarcho-syndicalists are, he goes on saying, "The C. N. T. refused to intervene, to show any solidarity in anarchist movements, not even in the popular rebellion of 1934."

Now, if this is true, how comes that the armored cars of which the rebels had taken possession in Oviedo and used them for the defense of the revolution, bore the initials C. N. T. on one side and F. A. I. (Iberian Anarchist Federation) on the other side? How comes?

Even if Tranquillo was too tranquil to go down to the street and see them in action, he certainly could see them pictured in the papers.

Then he says with the air of a great, wise man, "Surely, we cannot deny that we deal here with syndicalists, men who often absolutely ignore the most elementary idea of anarchy."

Now the question is, who ignores the most elementary idea of anarchy? Those who are always in opposition to every government and state and for "revolutionary, libertarian direct action" or those who invent stories, distort facts, and spread calumnies and confusion?

Let Tranquillo not worry about the "new theoreticians of a domesticated and converted syndicalism and anarchism," let him not lament about the painfulness of seeing "people who call themselves libertarians be carried away by politics."

The short but clear telegram from our Spanish comrades to the Secretariat of the I. W. M. A. shows that Tranquillo's—to put it gently—pessimism is unwarranted.

Anarcho-syndicalistically yours,

A. THORN

* * *

A Single Taxer Pleads His Cause

Most of man's misery is made by mankind's mistakes.

Man lives by applying work to land and to the products of land; land is the source of food and of all raw materials. No one can create wealth or even live without access to land. Only those who speculate or share in some monopoly can get rich without working. Even a high-jacker or a pickpocket would starve if he did not work at his business.

Independence depends not upon someone giving you a job, but upon free access to places to work. Possession of each piece of land by all is impossible, but exclusive occupancy must be assured; therefore each possessor of land should compensate those excluded from the more desirable holdings.

As land value is created by the presence and activities of the community, each landholder should pay to the community the annual rental value of whatever site or other land he holds. At present we pay these billions as land rent for permission to live on this earth to landholders who do not earn them.

If the community got the full value of the service it renders, there would be ample revenue to maintain that service. Taxes would be unnecessary, and Labor and Capital, being tax-exempt, would get as wages all they produce and, if money monopolies were destroyed, they would get whatever interest super-abundant capital might bring.

As nothing could be made from land without using it, land would be held only for use, and all unused land including water power, mines, etc., would be available free of purchase price. The doors of opportunity would be open to all.

If Land Rent were not paid to land holders, no one could get more than wages; hence, as one could not get wages by another's labor, exploitation would be impossible. Industry and progress would have a fair field.

Involuntary unemployment and poverty would cease; the Golden Age of our dreams would be made possible.

This is not "bolshevism" nor "communism." The New York State Constitution, Article I, Section 10, reads: "The people, in their right of sovereignty, are deemed to possess the original and ultimate property in and to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State." Other states have similar provisions.

BOLTON HALL

P. S.—I do not see how you do not recognize that your objective is entirely unobtainable without freedom of the individual. The people who would support us are crippled and prohibited far more by our system of monopoly (which monopolists are glad to hear called "capitalism") than by any statute or "strong arm methods." (I wonder how long the monopolists would last without the statutes and strong arm methods of Government?)—EDITOR.

Of course I am an anarchist. But anarchy is a state for freemen—and men can never be free while they have to pay someone for the privilege of living on earth. Did I not believe this, I would be working for your cause. Meanwhile you are with us even if we be not with you. I am sorry you still have a deficit. Enclosed is five dollars to help cancel it.—B. H.

* * *

An I.W.W.'s Opinion of this Journal

Received your circular letter and noted the underscored reason of it. It was an oversight on my part that acknowledgment of the receipt of MAN! was not made sooner. MAN! is placed in our reading room for all who wish to read it and when a new copy comes the old one is sent to various places where there are persons of known sympathetic sentiments towards anarchistic ideals.

MAN! is appreciated by all who come in contact with it even those who are opposed to anarchism and all it implies, the implications, of course being but the reflex of their state of mind. The I. W. W. and its members have been greatly influenced by anarchist philosophy and the application of its policies under the present regime as a means of emancipation of society, superficial denials by some of its self-appointed spokesmen as well as some of the self-styled advocates of anarchism to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is interesting to note, in view of your recent open letter that the *Nation* declined to publish, that MAN! was the only paper or journal that even makes a claim at being liberal that gave publicity to the resolution by the Lumber Workers Industrial Union of the I. W. W. calling upon the workers to take economic direct action to free Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings. All liberal and so-called radical papers and journals have repeatedly ignored the persecution and defense of the I. W. W. members in the eastern strikes. A conspiracy of silence towards the I. W. W. is maintained by capitalist as well as the liberal press and only those that hold views in accordance with the authoritarians are afforded any publicity.

BOOK REVIEW

Fascism by Lawrence Dennis, Harpers, N. Y., 1936

If half of the radicals would write in the clear, fair-minded and frank manner of Mr. Dennis they would appeal to the Americans in whom they have not as yet been able to arouse any sentiment except opposition.

"All government, liberal, no less than fascist or communist, has to be a MONOPOLY of force and violence, as one great statesman once called it, 'a perpetual conspiracy of power'." Few Anarchists have stated this fact as forcefully as has Mr. Dennis. This frankness continues in telling the capitalists that fascism is in no sense a fatal thing for them or their interests."

Mr. Dennis points out that those who are afraid that fascism will deprive them of their freedom do not realize that there is very little freedom today, and that in the past the Mormons were not free to practice their religion, and that in war time Christians were not free to quote the Sermon on the Mount. He speaks also of the freedom of the unemployed to starve today, and of the supposed freedom of the Negroes. He admits that in this country, as well as in Germany, Italy and Russia, there is little freedom, but questions the right of those who speak for one class of the proscripted to which they belong and not for all the insulted and injured of the world." Perhaps he has not heard of the Anarchist philosophy of freedom for all.

The author does not make the tactical mistake of trying to defend the tyranny in Germany and Italy. He states frankly that race hatreds have no place in America and believes that if the latest edict from Moscow can define Bolshevism, then Fascism which is nationalistic rather than internationalistic, has the right to define its policies in each country; and he gives himself the task of defining the American brand. He states that either the dictatorship of Communism or Fascism will have to come soon, and believes that the chances are fifty-fifty that Roosevelt can hold out for five years until the next world war. He agrees with the anarchist idea that the rule of the majority is just as evil as the rule of a dictatorship, although he looks upon this as a necessity. He feels that the elite are the ones who must rule in any society. How can he have the audacity to state that the Fascist will allow the elite among the "outs" to function much more than the capitalist or the communist does, in the face of the "liquidation" of the elite in Italy and Germany perhaps shows that it takes just this kind of audacity to make a true Fascist.

His criticism of the irresponsibility of the legislative, executive and judicial arms of our government, as well as that of the many pressure groups, coincides with the anarchist philosophy that responsibility on the part of the individual would not allow him to relegate the control of his actions to others; and that the voluntary assumption of the responsibility of functioning as a group in economic life on the part of the workers is the very foundation of an Anarchist society.

Mediums of free expression, as MAN!, are few and far between. Let us look forward to make efforts to build more and more of them.

BERT RUSSELL

Suggestions to Pierre Ramus

The article in the September issue of MAN!, "Why Does Anarchism Progress So Slowly?" (now also available in pamphlet form) by Pierre Ramus is, to my mind, the most timely and important contribution towards renewed activity in the Anarchist movement in recent years.

Although I disagree with many views expressed by Pierre Ramus—particularly his criticism on trade unionism and even syndicalism—on the grounds that he seems to underestimate the absolute necessity for workers to fight for their immediate betterment thus enabling them to lighten their burden to some extent; and also the value of solidarity and revolutionary training that most workers get in the unions through strikes, etc. Still I think the article as a whole is a concrete step towards a renewed effort of the movement. It is also a clarification and an inspiration for those comrades who have fallen away from the movement and have been drifting.

May I also suggest that you try to get comrade Ramus to write another article or perhaps a series of articles laying down a plan of action that would be based on the present situation on which perhaps all Anarchist groups in the United States could unite into one federation that could really do constructive work and thus contribute our share towards the liberation of workers. I know that it is a rather big order, but is it not time that we once and for all get together and begin to do real constructive work?

LEO FREEDMAN

To All Radical Publications

The International Institute for Social History at Amsterdam is a scientific body, having the object to promote the study of the whole field of social history as an independent branch of science.

It is of great importance that the public library, which already contains over one hundred thousand books, should also put at the disposal of students the leading periodicals of the labor movement.

We should like to acquire MAN! and your other publications continuously, since we feel certain that they would be of value as part of our permanent collection.

If you could see fit to place this Institute on your mailing list as a regular depository for your paper, publications and reports (and if possible also preceding numbers or collections) we could assure you that, as part of our collection, the materials you send would be very useful.

A. MILLER LEHNING
International Institute for Social History,
Keizersgracht 264, Amsterdam, Holland.

An Anarchist who does not believe in local or national government of course does not believe in a League of Nations or any sanctions by such a league. Dennis' conception of Fascism is that each country should cease its imperialism, dollar diplomacy, and entangling alliances; and that one who allowed himself to fight for another country, whether Britain or Italy, is both a poor patriot and a poor thinker. At the same time he visualizes a super army, navy and air force for the U. S. He thinks that it would not be likely for all the powerful State to fall in the hands of those who would abuse this power, and admits that if this were the case it would be undesirable. How he can look at Italy and Germany and not see power run riot might seem impossible for one who otherwise approaches problems in so realistic a manner.

His criticism of the weaknesses of capitalism and its inevitable doom seems to preclude an especial animosity toward bankers and lawyers. In writing of the supposed sacredness of the Constitution he asks: "Surely the only good Americans are not dead Americans—and those longest dead." The repudiation of debts by capitalist nations while refusing to allow Farmer Brown to repudiate his debt to the banker marks the downfall of the main principles of capitalism, he thinks. One feature of the book which is not stressed enough is that a discussion of the plans for a corporative state are not given, except the hint that we should not bother with forty-eight state governments; that large cities should be autonomous; and that representation in the national government should be by occupation rather than political party or geographical grouping. He infers that the large capitalist would have his industry taken over by the State and receive dividends, and that the small industry would not be disturbed. As industry today cannot support both capitalist and worker it would seem queer to expect it to support an added bureaucracy of Fascists in the future.

"The in-elite can be controlled or disciplined only by forces within themselves... External controls... laws, courts, the police, are largely worthless for the in-elite... for the in-elite themselves will operate such institutional controls. This is true equally under liberalism, fascism, or communism." This assertion by Mr. Dennis recognizes the basic principle of Anarchism that the only control worthwhile is the control of the individual over himself. If it is recommended for the elite why not for all the remainder of us? The Anarchist will admit that it will be some time before a majority of the people in any country will have waded through the morass of external controls and will have arrived at an appreciation of the value and necessity of an anarchist society. That is all the more reason why we need less external control of Fascism and Communism.

AMMON A. HENNACY

ART AND LITERATURE

Evening Mood

It is twilight. My wife lies sprawled on the bed before me, and sleeps. I sit here slouched by the window filled with an intolerable melancholy while the thin voices of boys playing in the driveway float up and I hear the sound of a ball. But they grow quiet soon and all I hear is the rustling of leaves, and rain looks imminent. I sit here, I say, slumped in the corner chair of our furnished room and stare at the angular roof-tops of the one-family houses across the yards. And as it grows darker my gloom also thickens.

For I am laid off over a month now; the rayon mill, my foreman tells me, is only working the morning shift, and I worked through the night. I keep thinking. I keep wondering what lies in store for my wife and I. We are married only four months. It is hell for things to come thus, our funds rapidly diminishing and going without suppers. No, I think, it can't continue much longer. Something will have to be done. But already I have suggested that she live with her mother, and she has utterly refused to even consider this. She won't live without me, she says.

She is young, my wife, and has a child-like quality about her. She is impulsive and quick to tears as well as blitheness. She is without sophistications and I am highly attached to her. I hate to think of her working in the brassiere shop. She should be studying, doing something educational in a young leisure, but not slaving away in the brassiere shop. When I was working I thought to send her to a music school, for she loves the piano, but her father isn't working yet, and there is no immediate sign that he will, and she goes on giving her mother part of her small salary. There are four of them home.

The room we now live in is fine. It is bright and clean, and the house is of the bourgeois kind. It is our second home. When we came here my wife was delighted with its soft bed and the steady supply of hot water and the maid service. For where we lived before these were things wanting. And so we came here, and for weeks even though I never could get used to sleeping days, we were happy, my wife and I. We'd attend lectures and concerts in New York on week-ends, see an imported movie now and then, and dine in a Chinese restaurant where we'd meet some of our friends. And we'd return home with a cultural sense of satisfaction. We both knew that what we had done was small in its way, but nevertheless, an evening well spent.

What a wedding party we had! There had been great merriment and drunkenness, great laughter and even my grandmother drank. Oh, what celebration, and we were given over a hundred dollars in gifts.

We spent with abandon, my wife and I, for the world was ours. We indulged in expensive clothes and objects, we dined in expensive restaurants, and bought many books. Did my wife's eye meet a fancied thing then she soon possessed it. Did I desire another pipe, then I soon was breaking it in. Joyous were our spending excursions, our happiness was for none to share.

But there were the discomforts of the two rooms we resided in, and they stood like shadows across the brilliance of our marriage. So we came here to this imposing former one-family house of twelve large rooms. That the three other tenants were of the unfriendly variety bothered us none, we needed no one. And we told each other we had no desire for friendship with the owner of a dress factory, or the snooty old woman with the Boston accent, or the divorced woman with her child. No, ours was an ecstatic adventure and we wished to travel it alone.

My wife lies there with her arm flung out in a dead sleep. They say one turns over any number of times in the course of sleep, but she has not changed her position for more than three hours. She could be dead for all that life means at this moment. Poor child, she is so tired. I have said to her that her happiness stands before any feeling of my own, and that it may hurt now for me to go off, but later when the hurt disappeared it might be better. I say to her that on her salary alone she could live comfortably, buy things and take in entertainments. But she tells me to stop talking. She says she couldn't go on without me.

What can I do? Can I take the matter in my own hands, go off and when I find a job reconcile her? But my wife's child-like faith and dependency in me is a tide I cannot cope with. It engulfs me with an emotion that is at once joyous, and yet despairing.

All day long she works in the brassiere shop snipping threads off brassieres and examining them for damages. She works with forty others amid the high, steady hum of electric motors and the sound of the scraping metals of the adjacent machine shop and the roaring and rumbling trains passing on the siding behind the shop. It is hot now, and work is hard and heavy, she says, and girls faint occasionally.

At ten minutes past noon I meet my wife at her mother's where we eat lunch. Time was when I'd refuse a cup of tea from her mother but today I silently, and humbly, if I may say so, eat. My wife's mother has been told to stay in the hospital for six months because of her high blood pressure, but she asks bitterly who will attend to the needs of the family if she is gone. And she goes on ever busy about the house, and seeking out the cheapest grocers and generally doing the best she is able with the relief check she gets bi-weekly. My father-in-law is a plasterer and hasn't worked for years.

So we meet there and her mother serves us. Her mother is very solicitous of our well being, though she wept and fairly broke into hysteria when we told her of our plan to marry. We were frightened into silence for she is normally a quiet woman, small and pleasant. I have always thought of my wife's family as one thinks of children. However, the mother of my wife became reconciled and said that she only hoped that we'd keep our jobs.

And now I am not working. My mother used to complain during the first months of my marriage. Why don't you come over more often with your wife, my son, she would say. And

now when I come alone on an afternoon my mother says, Well, my son? And my heart feels as though it were tarred with the blackest pitch.

I sit here in the rapidly growing dusk and wonder. The outlines of the roof tops are now hazy. My body feels chilled and clammy. How weak I am.

My wife says that we shall both move to New York. She will commute. We shall live on the East Side until I get a job. It will be hard but she is willing to forego many things, she says. In New York there will be more chance of getting work. I won't have to sit and look at the four walls all day because I hesitate to use money on fares, money that we use for breakfasts and personal needs. These are her words.

So it is settled. We will search out a cheap furnished room and establish ourselves as best we can. Haven't you a prospect, already? she says on a note of optimism. You see, last week a friend sent me to the proprietor of a Bowery restaurant who is an intimate of several hotels in that sector. Oh, I'd do anything, and working seven nights a week means nothing. But a week has already passed since he told me he'd let me know. And I know the emptiness of such promises too well.

How exhausted my wife must be in this humid night. She lies stretched there like a corpse, and I wonder with trembling body if death were not a better fate than what confronts us. For my wife, I say, is of child-like quality. She is not one to think of complaining. And her menses are four days over-due.

HAROLD LAMBERT

Recantation

O you for whom we mourned, long years of grieving,
Forgive us that we turn from self-deceiving;
Long years we paced the cloistered, shadowy cell
In spirit-passion's lonely hours of pain;
Is it sinful to go free again?

We have been loyal but loyalty naught avails
For him who long in silence grief regales;
Too harsh the pain, and then hysterical laughter
Sweeps all before it, sunders tombs of hell—
Lost loves go singing, and we follow after.

We will come nearer if we cease our grieving,
Cross your path sooner if more unbelieving.

W. D. ROWELL

World War Monument

*This monstrous monolith of granite,
A monumental bayonet—
Angled phallus of War-death: Sodome,
Is wreathed with oil-stained newspapers, dog-droppings.
And the unemployed,
On one side of the base:
CHATEAU THIERRY, BELLEAU WOODS, THE
MEUSE, THE ARGONNE:*

*On another:
THE WELCOME HOME CLUB, WARD 2, SOMER-
VILLE, 1920.*

*The remaining sides I
Refrained from inspecting.*

KENNETH PORTER

Fatherland

*Between
Her German-peasant breasts
She cracked his Nazi skull
As she would a nut,
But she found no kernel,
Only grey and Aryan yolks,
And, folks,
That is why they stood her
Up against a wall
And with leaden bullets
Keen as a knife,
They cut down her quivering
Semitic string of life.
The world has just
One woman less, a buxom Jewess,
A female ape, who would not let a Nazi rape.*

FRANK ANKEUBRAND, JR.

Dirge

*Black roots, wrestling with grey granite,
Are like so many snake-fingers
Crushing armoured prey in a vice of hate.
Roots must go deep,
Roots must find and feed
Upon hearts of granite,
Roots must crack and break assunder
These tall grey cliffs,
Or topple down and crash like thunder,
Trunks and boughs of leaves,
Lying to tremble in the rain
Or dry in the hot winds of a lost battle.
Roots of trees must wrestle with grey granite or die.*

FRANK ANKENBRAND, JR.

Makers of Profit

*Makers of profit, strivers for gain,
What is your purpose, where is your goal?
Fathers of war, creators of pain,
Where is the glory in world control?
Look at your fingers, pincers of steel,
Manglers of freedom, maimers of joy;*

*After the triumph, after the deal
How much will prove but worthless alloy?*

*Makers of money, lovers of gain,
What can you do with all you acquire?
Promoters of hate, breeders of pain,
Is there no end to your blind desire?
Stamped on your face in figures of brass
Misery tells the price of your aim;
How would you fare should millions amass,
Those you condemn to torture and shame?*

*Makers of profit, misers of gain,
All roads must end in some sort of grave.
After you plundered, killed to attain,
How will you answer to those you deprave?
Blind as the mole, heartless as stone,
Gluttons, quite soon you'll have to disgorge;
You will descend, surrender your throne—
Better destroy the shackles you forge.*

*Hoarders of money, badgers of gain,
Butchers of youth, defilers of age,
How will you meet the on-coming train—
Builders of fire and brewers of rage?
How will you face your rivers of blood?
How will you stop your long baffled horde
Riding the torrent, bringing the flood
Too deep, too fast for cowards to ford?*

JACK GREENBERG

Progress

The history of man informs us that the independent thinker has always been maligned, persecuted, imprisoned, or sometimes suffered death at the hands of the ignorant, for refusing to "run with the herd."

Accepting as true the false teachings of paid servants of capitalism, enthrones dictators, or what is worse, a despotic bureaucracy. If we are to retain the progress of this modern age, and to press onward to that ideal condition of equity, peace and happiness, it will be accomplished by the ones who think for themselves.

All progress of the past has been brought to fruition by dissenters who had faith in their convictions, and the courage and determination to fight for them. The one who thinks for himself usually succeeds in getting on the mental road that leads to truth and justice. The one, who parrot-like, repeats "his master's voice," is hopeless. He does not think for himself. He "runs with the herd."

HUGH BRADFORD REED

Books and Pamphlets Received

Aux Sources de la Douleur—L. Barbedette. Pamphlet, 59 pages. La Brochure Mensuelle, Abonnement annuel: 12 fr. Bidault, 39, Rue de Bertragne, Paris, France.

Bakunine et sa Confession (La Legende de la Dictature chez Bakunine)—Hem Day. Pamphlet, 41 pages. Same publishers as above.

Breaking into Print—Various authors. Pamphlet, 24 pages. 25 cents. Independent Press. 360 Preston Street, Ottawa, Canada.

Christianity on the Nazi Cross—Pamphlet, 20 pages. Labor Chest for Relief and Liberation of Workers of Europe. 3 West 16th Street, New York, N. Y.

Epu—Daniel Speers. Pamphlet, 30 pages. 10 cents. Daniel Spiers, Phoenix, Arizona.

Esperanto—Grammar and Vocabulary. Pamphlet, 13 pages. Nie Bulteno, 117 N. Bunker Hill Ave., Los Angeles, Cal.

Estructura y Funcionamiento de la Sociedad Comunista Libertaria—Gaston Leval. Pamphlet, 32 pages. 30 cents. Marti Vilanova, 88, 2, I, Barcelona, (P. N.) Spain.

Frans Mesereel—Jacques Mesnil. Translated from the French by Rose Freeman-Ishill. 21 pages. Bound and privately printed by The Oriole Press, Berkeley Heights, New Jersey.

Free Ferrero and Sallitto. Pamphlet, 16 pages. 5 cents. Ferrero-Sallito Defense Conference. P. O. Box 181, Station D, New York, N. Y.

Le Sterilisation Sexuelle—Norbert Bartosek. 103 pages, paper cover. 5 francs. Pensee & Action, Maison des Artistes, 19 Grand Place Bruxelles, Belgium.

L'Organisation de la Vindictive appelle Justice—Peter Kropotkin. Pamphlet, 19 pages. Publishers—same as of first two pamphlets listed above.

Mobilisation Contre Toute Guerre!—Barthelemy De Light. Pamphlet, 50 pages. Frs. 2.00. Publishers same as of "Le Sterilisation Sexuelle."

National Defense—John Franklin. Pamphlet, 17 pages. 5 cents. American League Against War and Fascism. 112 E. 19th Street, New York, N. Y.

The Atheist's Prayer—Jean Richepin. Also poems by Victor Hugo, Eugene Pottier and John Henry Mackay. English versification by Benj. R. Tucker. Same publishers as of "Frans Mesereel."

The Two Anarchisms—Henry Seymour. Pamphlet, 9 pages. Same publishers as of "The Atheist's Prayer."

Youth Demands Peace—James Lerner. Pamphlet, 23 pages. 5 cents. Same publishers as of "National Defense."

What is the law of nature? Is it to know that my security and that of my family, all my amusements and pleasures, are purchased at the expense of misery, deprivation, and suffering to thousands of human beings—by the terror of the gallows, by the misfortune of thousands stifling within prison-walls, by the fears inspired by millions of soldiers and guardians of civilization, torn from their homes and besotted by discipline, to protect our pleasures with loaded revolvers against the possible interference of the famishing! Is it to purchase every fragment of bread that I put in my mouth and the mouths of my children by the numberless privations that are necessary to procure my abundance? Or is it to be certain that my piece of bread only belongs to me when I know that every one else has a share, and that no one starves while I eat.

—LEO TOLSTOI.

WIDESPREAD CAMPAIGN OF EXILING DISSENTERS

On March 18th the Secretary of Labor issued two warrants for the deportation to Cuba of Oscar Landau and his wife, Julia Landau. Oscar Landau and his wife were arrested without a warrant by an Immigration Inspector on January 14, 1936, and taken to Ellis Island. Landau asked to see his lawyer but was denied the right by the Immigration Inspector. Oscar Landau is a member of the Laundry Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Union, Local 810, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Julia Landau is a member of the Dressmakers Union, ILGWU, Local 22, also affiliated with the A. F. of L. Landau was employed by a New York Laundry. He was arrested because of his union activity as a member of the Strike Committee. He was not born in Cuba but came to the United States from there. His wife is a Cuban citizen and a refugee from the dictatorship terror which has gripped her native land. Both the Dressmakers Union and the Laundry Drivers, Chauffeurs and Helpers Union are co-operating with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in attempting to stop the deportation of Julia Landau because she is a political refugee from Cuban oppression. Max Delson, New York attorney, has been retained to defend the Landaus.

* * *

Jesus Pallares, father of five American-born children and a resident of the United States for twenty-two of his thirty-eight years, is being held for deportation to Mexico. A confidential communication to the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born discloses a few of the forces pushing the deportation proceedings against Pallares:

The probable reason for the arrest of Pallares during the preliminary hearing on the *Gallup* case in April, 1935, is that at the outbreak of terror in *Gallup*, on April 5, 1935, Pallares led a protest demonstration of several hundred members of the *Liga Obrera* before the Governor's mansion in Santa Fe, protesting against the abolition of civil and constitutional rights in *Gallup*. The prosecutors of the *Gallup* case evidently expected another demonstration at the conclusion of the preliminary hearing (at which fourteen were held on little evidence), and arrested Pallares in order to prevent it.

* * *

Walter Baer, civil engineer of Portland, Oregon, formerly employed by the United States Government and now held for deportation to Nazi Germany, has been released from Ellis Island after being imprisoned for six months on a \$2,000 cash bail bond supplied by the Walter Baer Defense Committee of Portland. A "moral turpitude" crime for which Baer served full time seventeen years ago is the basis of the present deportation charge. His real crime, though, is having been the constructor of a Public Sewerage project. He has a wife and three children, all native born. Baer is of German descent. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is handling the defense of his case.

* * *

Otto Richter, 21-year-old anti-Nazi who fled to the United States in 1933, after being beaten up by Storm Troopers, was scheduled for deportation to the Nazi henchmen for May 15th. A writ of habeas corpus stopped his immediate exile. Since coming here he married an American-born citizen. The same committee is carrying on the fight to stay his deportation, which, if allowed to be carried out, means a sure death sentence for him when reaching Germany.

* * *

President Franklin D. Roosevelt has personally replied to an appeal sent him by the Machinists Union, Local 382 in Minneapolis, Minnesota, for the lives of the eleven anti-Nazis who face deportation to Hitler Germany. The President said he will give the appeal consideration.

* * *

The Minnesota State Convention of the Farmer-Labor Women's Federation recently passed a resolution against deportations as have some of the local clubs of the Federation. A personal letter of protest against the use of the deportations laws to deny the right of asylum to political refugees in the United States has been sent to the Secretary of Labor by Mrs. M. Colby, State Chairman of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. The Educational Department of the Farmers Union is also taking action on this question.

The eleven anti-Nazis who face deportation are: Alfred Miller, Walter Baer, Adam Mueller, Otto Richter, Carl Ohm, Walter Sause, Benno Martini, Erich Becker, Joseph Ganghauser, Charles Rowoldt, and Fred Wermann. Their defense is being conducted by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

The Committee asks that letters protesting these deportations should be sent to President Roosevelt and Secretary of Labor Perkins. A printed form letter with the pictures of the eleven anti-Nazis facing deportation can be obtained from the Committee's office, Room 1409, 100 Fifth Avenue, New York.

* * *

The Ferrero-Sallito Defense Conference (P. O. Box 181, Station D, New York City) will gladly send to anyone upon request the 16-page pamphlet that they have just published. Individuals and groups wishing to distribute these pamphlets are urged to request same from the Committee. It is a full and detailed exposition of the entire frame-up upon which the "new deal" administration is doing its utmost to hand over these two men to Mussolini, thereby also driving a knife into the back of this journal, since that is the main motive which prompted the "law brigade" to institute deportation proceedings against both Ferrero and Sallito.

A mass meeting was held on May 15, 1936, at the Rand School, New York City, to protest the deportation of all those who are now facing imprisonment or death—if exiled to

Germany, Italy or any fascist-ruled country.

* * *

Raimundo Estrada, native of Puerto Rico, was released from Ellis Island Thursday afternoon, all charges against him being dropped by the Immigration authorities. Attorney Irving E. Epstein, retained by the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, secured Estrada's release. Raimundo Estrada was imprisoned on Ellis Island for ten and a half months before the Committee was informed of his predicament and was furnished with definite proof of his citizenship: a Puerto Rican birth certificate and a Seaman's Certificate of the Department of Commerce certifying that Estrada is an American citizen.

The same committee stayed the deportation of Casimiro Cafero to Italy on May 2nd just 30 minutes before the ship left. He has been here since 1915. A technical charge of having left the United States while working as a seaman is the basis for his deportation. His brother, an active labor leader in the trade union movement, has been jailed by the fascists, and doubt exists as to whether he is still living.

* * *

On April 21st Judge Patterson of the Federal District Court of the Southern District of New York upheld the Department of Labor's order of deportation against Mrs. Henrietta Vendemmia. Mrs. Vendemmia faces deportation to Italy and is being defended by Attorney Irving Schwab, (of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born), who has appealed her case to the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals. Mrs. Vendemmia is married to a naturalized citizen of the United States. They have three children, all of whom are naturalized citizens. The charge against Mrs. Vendemmia is based on the fact that she became a "public charge" within five years after her entry. However, her family has expressed their desire to support her.

* * *

Fairmont, Minn., April 6.—An 85-year old World War veteran who was born in Troy, New York, and has spent sixty years in the United States, faced deportation today.

David Ogilvie, a Minnesota pioneer, sought to enlist in the A. E. F. when the U. S. declared war on Germany. He was rejected because of his age, then 66, but was accepted by the

British Expeditionary Force as an engineer in the British Channel ferry service.

After the war he received a soldier's homestead in Australia. That made him an Australian citizen. But he returned here in 1934.

"Now," he said today, "the Immigration Department insists my visitor's visa has expired and I must return to Australia."

* * *

Nathan Cosman, 16-year-old student at the J. J. Ferris High School, in Jersey City, N. J., was picked up, held for deportation to Canada and given a preliminary hearing by the Immigration officials. Nathan was born in Nova Scotia, Halifax, and has been released in his father's custody. Nathan's father, George Cosman, is free under a \$500 bail bond and faces deportation on a charge of "illegal entry" from Canada. He is Austrian by birth, Ukrainian by nationality, and is being held for deportation to Roumania. Mrs. Marion Cosman was born in New York City in 1899 but lost her American citizenship when she married a non-citizen. The immigration officer who arrested her husband and her son threatened Mrs. Cosman with deportation.

Attorney Irving E. Epstein, of New York City, has been retained to represent the Cosmans, father and son, at their Department of Labor deportation hearing on Ellis Island on Monday, April 27th, at 1 p. m. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is conducting their defense and requests that letters be sent to the Secretary of Labor protesting the destruction of the Cosman family by the deportation proceedings against George and Nathan Cosman.

FREEDOM

A Journal of Libertarian Thought, Work and Literature

Annual subscription 1s.6d., Post Free

2, MALDEN CRESCENT, LONDON, N.W. 1,
ENGLAND

JIM CORRIGAN

The *Industrial Worker* of May 9th brings the sad news of the passing away of Jim Corrigan on April 19th. Cleveland, where he died, knew him best. So did the crowds who assembled at the Public Square. No one ever grew tired in listening to Jim Corrigan. His deep cutting humor and eloquence as well as his endurance to orate in the open for hours and hours is well known to everyone who listened to him. He truly was a people's orator. Only his unsteady alliances, one day with the I. W. W. and another day with forces of bad political repute—which he himself admitted to me—prevented Jim Corrigan from occupying the important place in the anarchist movement that his ability fully deserved. To the anarchist fold he always returned with renewed vigor and confidence. Significantly enough, as in the case of reporting the death of Nina Van Zandt Spies, the *Industrial Worker* again makes no mention of the word anarchist in the story of the death of Jim Corrigan. The impression is being made that he was nothing else but a dyed in the wool I. W. W. No one would protest stronger against that than Jim himself.

M. G.

NOTES

FRANCE—Bourtoisek, Harel and Prevot, accused of propagating the idea of vasectomy in Bourdeaux, have been sentenced to: Bourtoisek three years' imprisonment and ten years of interdiction of sojourn, Harel and Prevot, six months and five years... fine and trial costs.

Protest meetings have started to take place; S. Faure is booked for one of them in Bordeaux.

BELGIUM—The Minister of Justice in the government is a socialist. Yet the following governmental crime has just been perpetrated: Last April 3rd, five German political refugees were arrested by the Belgian secret police; four of them were taken to the German frontier where they were picked up by the Nazi authorities. Among them was Henry Bell, a member of the Communist party who was searched for by the German police for his political activity.

It would be criminal on our part as anarchists not to protest against such a vile scandal.

C. I. D. A.—Hem Day.

INTERNATIONAL LANGUAGE—The Anarchist Idiot Group "Luz" gives a practical course by correspondence of the beautiful, euphonious, and easily learned international auxiliary language, Ido.

For further information or registration write to: Grupo "Luz," Calle International 95, (Ciet) Barcelona, Spain. (Enclose an international stamp.)

* * *

STRUGGLE—Long prison terms were set for the five criminal syndicalism prisoners, all men, in San Quentin penitentiary by the California State Board of Prison Terms and Paroles on April 9th. Pat Chambers, Martin Wilson and Jack Crane were given five years. Sentences of three and a half years were set for Albert Houghardy and Norman Mini, who may serve the last 18 months of his sentence on parole.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

(April 15 to May 15)

Income	\$109.65
Balance on hand	12.13
Total	\$121.78
Expenditures	122.10
Deficit	\$.32
(Included in above statement from Groups)	
Phila., Pa., G. L., \$10; Chicago, Ill., \$7.00; San Francisco, Cal., \$51.00.	

Health Problems

The value of fruit juices is as yet much too little appreciated. Fruits differ from practically all other foods in the fact that their nutritive elements exist in the soluble forms of sugar, dextrin and acids, and hence are almost exclusively found in their juices. The dry pulp left after the expression of the juice contains almost nothing except cellulose, a little protein and the major part of the salts.

Fruit juices of all sorts are exceedingly wholesome. They contain all the valuable properties of the fruits from which they are prepared with the exception of cellulose. The popular prejudice against acid fruit juices on the ground that they encourage the development of rheumatism is entirely without scientific basis. Fruit juices, like fruits, are rich in the salts of sodium and potassium and increase the alkalinity of the blood and tissue fluids.

The aromatic oils of fruit juices which give to them their characteristic flavours are appetizing and thus promote digestion. It is probable that many persons who are in the habit of using light wines, value them for their fruity flavours rather than for any effects experienced from the alcohol present. An effort should be made to replace wine and beer by fruit juices of different sorts.

By means of a recent invention, it is now possible to retain in fruit juices, in concentrated form, the aroma which was formerly lost in the processes of canning and condensation.

Fruits and fruit juices are for the most part eaten as luxuries rather than food staples. As a matter of fact, fruits and the juices of fruits are worthy of a more dignified position on the bill of fare. A half pint of grape juice has a food value of 200 calories, fully equal to that of a like quantity of milk, though of a different sort, consisting of sugar with practically no protein or fat.

Fruit juices, even when diluted, as in the form of lemonade, orangeade and similar drinks, contain an amount of nourishment worth considering; in fact, with the exception of lemon and orange juice, fruit juices in general are practically equal to milk in the actual amount of nutriment which they supply.

Of course, none of these juices could take the place of milk as a food for the reason that the nutrient which they furnish is almost exclusively carbohydrate. There are conditions, however, in which exclusive carbohydrate feeding is desirable, as in certain cases of acidosis. In such cases fruit juices become a valuable resource.

Fruits usually contain the antiscorbutic vitamin but are, however, rather poor in other vitamins. This important fact, to which attention has been called, emphasizes the necessity for accurate information in the making of bills of fare for the sick, since it may frequently happen that the patient is already suffering from a deficiency of some one or all of the several vitamins known to be essential to good nutrition. For example, a person attempting to live on a diet of fruits and nuts would suffer from lack of the water soluble C, antiscorbutic vitamin, if the bill of fare was largely made up of dried fruits such as figs, dates and raisins with nuts even though the supply of carbohydrates, fats and protein might be very ample.

On this account it is necessary to include with the fruit and nut diet a liberal allowance of oranges to supply water soluble vitamin B and C, and greens, carrots, butter or tomato to supply the needed fat soluble A.

The tomato, either fresh or dried, is always a most safe addition to the bill of fare because it is rich in all the vitamins.

THE INDIAN NATUROPATH